

25/2  
New Series

Volume IX, Number 34

May 1958

# The Review of English Studies

*A Quarterly Journal of  
English Literature and the English Language*

Editors

PETER ALEXANDER.  
NORMAN DAVIS

Assistant Editor

JEAN ROBERTSON

## CONTENTS

Beowulf's Fight with the Dragon. By Kenneth Sisam . . .	129
Two Treatises by Thomas Digges. By Francis R. Johnson . .	141
Some Lines from Pope. By Ralph N. Maud . . . . .	146
William Motherwell and Robert A. Smith. By William Montgomerie . . . . .	152

## NOTES

Additions and Alterations in Cotton MS. Julius E VII (Geoffrey Needham) . . . . .	160
Translations of the Classics into English before 1600 (Holger Nørgaard) . . . . .	164
Writing in Sand in <i>Titus Andronicus</i> IV. i (James G. McMan- away) . . . . .	172
<i>Merry Wives of Windsor</i> , III. iii. 176 ('uncap') (Alice Walker)	173
Donne's Compass (Doris C. Powers) . . . . .	173

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net. Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

JUN 13 1958

PERIODICALS  
READING ROOM

# The Review of English Studies

*Advisory Panel:* H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR WALTER GREG; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

---

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The University, Glasgow, W. 2. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

---

## CONTENTS (continued)

### REVIEWS, ETC.

Bibliography of the Eddas, by Johann S. Hanneßon, 176; Britain in Medieval French Literature 1100-1500, by P. Rickard, 177; The Equatorie of the Planetis, edited from Peterhouse MS. 75. I, by Derek J. Price, with a linguistic analysis by R. M. Wilson, 179; Studies on Chaucer and his Audience, by Mary Giffin, 183; Scottish Poetry. A Critical Survey, edited by James Kinsley, 184; Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance, by Ruth Kelso, 186; Shakespeare's Appian. A Selection from the Tudor Translation of Appian's *Civil Wars*, edited by Ernest Schanzer, 187; Textual Problems of the First Folio, by Alice Walker; *Othello*, edited by Alice Walker and John Dover Wilson (The New Shakespeare), 188; *King Richard II*, edited by Peter Ure (Arden Shakespeare), 193; Unity in Shakespearean Tragedy. The Interplay of Theme and Character, by Brents Stirling, 195; The Jacobean and Caroline Stage, Vols. III, IV, and V. Plays and Playwrights, by Gerald Eades Bentley, 196; *Thèmes et Formes de la Poésie 'Métaphysique'*, by Jean-Jacques Denonain, 202; The Metaphysicals and Milton, by E. M. W. Tillyard, 205; The Life Records of John Milton, Vols. II, III, and IV, edited by J. Milton French, 207; A Century of English Farce, by Leo Hughes, 209; Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man, by Ellen Douglass Leyburn, 210; The Correspondence of Alexander Pope, edited by George Sherburn, 212; The Major Satires of Alexander Pope, by Robert W. Rogers, 214; The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, by Robert Halsband, 216; The Achievement of Samuel Johnson, by Walter Jackson Bate; Dr. Johnson's Dictionary. Essays in the Biography of a Book, by James H. Sledd and Gwin J. Kolb, 217; William Collins: Drafts & Fragments of Verse, edited by J. S. Cunningham, 220; The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill, edited by Douglas Grant, 222; Lord Byron's Marriage. The Evidence of Asterisks, by G. Wilson Knight, 224; The Imperial Intellect. A Study of Cardinal Newman's Educational Ideal, by A. Dwight Culler, 225; FitzGerald's *Salaman and Absal*, by A. J. Arberry, 227; The Diaries of John Ruskin, 1835-1847, selected and edited by Joan Evans and John Howard Whitehouse, 229; *Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap utgivna av Nyfilologiska Sällskapet i Stockholm*, 231; Short Notices, 233; Summary of Periodical Literature, 235; List of Publications Received, 237.

## BEOWULF'S FIGHT WITH THE DRAGON

By KENNETH SISAM

ALTHOUGH *Beowulf* has been so elaborately studied, I have always wanted more about the fight with the Dragon. Lecturers and editors tend to hurry as time closes in on them, and they have a great deal else to explain in this last part. Yet the fight is the heart of the adventure. I propose to go over the text again, preferring what it says plainly to what is obscure or controversial, and making no attempt to do justice to the special literature. So my approach is more elementary than that of the commentators, who are much occupied with doubts and difficulties. Perhaps it comes nearer to the level of the Anglo-Saxon audience for whom the poem was made. They could not study a long poem minutely as they heard it read or recited. Even if the delivery was slow, they had no opportunity to examine any verse or sentence closely, comparing what had been said already and what came later: nor could they inquire how others understood it. I do not suppose that, because they were Anglo-Saxons, they knew the explanation of everything that troubles a modern commentator. Many points are brought to notice by the techniques of literary and linguistic criticism, and the Anglo-Saxons knew nothing of these techniques as they are now applied to poetry in the vernacular. The atmosphere of an Anglo-Saxon hall, the thoughts and feelings of the company who listened to *Beowulf*,<sup>1</sup> are proper subjects for speculation; and there is reason to expect that fighting would have a special interest for the audience.

Let us begin with the Hoard, about which the quarrel arose. Its origin is given at length (2233-70):—Before he dies, a man whose name was forgotten, the last of a noble race, hides in a rocky cavity their accumulated treasures of arms, goblets, dishes, &c., when there was nobody left to use or polish them. No reason is given why he should dispose of the treasures in this way, except that, by doing so, he restores to the earth metal that was won from it (2247-9).<sup>2</sup> It is not said that he expected them to be found again by friends or that he hid them from enemies; or that he intended to lie beside them when he died, or to benefit from them in an after-life. But it would be unnatural to leave such treasures lying about, and, after all, the Hoard has to be accounted for.

An incidental reference later in the poem (3052) adds a variant detail.

<sup>1</sup> Even if it could be shown that *Beowulf* was composed and written down for the private entertainment or instruction of one man, its style is moulded by the conditions of recital to a company assembled in their lord's hall for food and drink at the end of the day. Professor Dorothy Whitelock's *The Audience of Beowulf* (Oxford, 1951) should help to correct a tendency to treat the poem as if it were written for modern scholars.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the Mailcoat Riddle: *Mec se wæta wong . . . ærist cende*, and its Latin original.

## 130 SISAM: BEOWULF'S FIGHT WITH THE DRAGON

There the Hoard is said to have been bound by a spell (*galdre bewunden*) so that nobody could touch it unless God willed. The protecting spell is a commonplace of early treasure stories; but a spell that can be broken whenever God wills does not help plot-construction, and no certain use is made of it. In *Beowulf*, touches from folk-lore are sometimes introduced at unexpected places: thus the giant's glove (fingerless of course), in which Grendel carried off victims to his cave after he had satisfied his hunger, is first mentioned in the recapitulation of the story at Hygelac's court,<sup>1</sup> though it could have been noticed appropriately at ll. 123 ff. or 1583. And not much care is given to the congruence of these added details. Beowulf's refusal to use his sword because Grendel did not know the advantages that weapons gave (679 ff.) does not fit well with the later disclosure that Grendel was charmed against swords (804), or with the presence of a giant's sword in the monsters' den (1557 ff.). That Beowulf was despised in his youth as slow and unpromising (2183 ff.) conflicts with his own account of his upbringing (2428 ff.) and of his swimming-match against Breca when they were boys (*cnihtwesende* 535). It seems that ideas associated in the popular mind with the matter in hand were sometimes used as interesting embellishments rather than as factors in the plot; and their familiarity would lull any critical faculty in the audience so long as the discrepancies were not sharply juxtaposed.

There is yet a third account (3069-73):—The great men who deposited the Hoard—not one man—solemnly declared (*diope benemdon*) that whoever robbed it should suffer the torments of Hell. There is no 'escape clause' here; but again the penalty is disregarded in the narrative, which does not suggest that the slave, Wiglaf, the other seven who carry off the treasure (3120 ff.), or Beowulf himself, are damned. Not only is the discrepancy glaring,<sup>2</sup> but the passage in which it occurs is the despair of commentators in both construction and meaning. Sievers's later work cannot safely be used by those who do not accept his premises; yet surely delicacy of ear or the instinct of genius has led him to the right solution here: that these five lines are an interpolation.<sup>3</sup> It is the more likely because

<sup>1</sup> 2085 ff. A few lines before (2076), by an odd coincidence or, more likely, an odd association of ideas, the poet mentions that the name of the Geatish warrior killed by Grendel (740 ff.) was *Hondscio*, which means 'glove'.

<sup>2</sup> Klaeber's explanation (note to 2231 ff.) that the same hoard had been buried on a previous occasion is incredible.

<sup>3</sup> *Paul u. Braunes Beiträge*, lv (1931), 376. If 3069-73 are secluded, there remains, after a reflection on the strange ways by which men meet their destined ends:

Swa was Biowulfe þa he biorges weard  
sohte searoniðas; seolfa ne cuðe  
purh hwæt his worulde gedal weorðan sceolde [        ].  
Næs he (?)goldhwæte gearwor hæfde  
agendes est ær gesceawod.

Sievers's suggestion that the interpolation has displaced part of the original text saves

they have their parallel in formal dedications of property: they correspond to the usual clause in Anglo-Saxon charters which threatens anybody who breaks the disposition with damnation, the companionship of Judas, of Ananias and Sapphira, or the like.

The Hoard was hidden in a mound or hill close by the sea (*wæteryðum neah* 2242), under a headland called Earnanæs (3031). The entrance to the hiding-place was at the foot of the ness, above the reach of the waves, for Beowulf lies dead *on sande* (3033), and the Dragon's body is pushed *ofer weallclif* (3132), which need not imply any great height. The first reference (2241-3) indicates that the *beorh* or *hlæw* was built for the purpose: *beorh eallgæaro . . . niwe be næsse nearocræftum fæst*. The later mention of columns and arches agrees, though these terms could be used to describe a natural cave.<sup>1</sup> If it stood alone, we might take as a chance inconsistency the stream that bursts out from the *beorh* (2545 ff.), hot when the Dragon is breathing fire inside, cold enough (I suppose) for Wiglaf to bathe Beowulf's face with its water when the Dragon is dead (2722, 2791 f.). Yet other details suggest a natural cave. On lonely coasts there are still caves in the sea-cliffs, sometimes carrying a runnel of water, known to few because they are invisible from the landward side and not obviously accessible, often remembered as hiding-places for fugitives or for smuggled goods. Such a cave suits better with the narrative, especially with the secrecy of the entrance: although it is near a centre of the Geatish population, it is *eldum uncuð* (2214), and Beowulf takes the slave with him as guide (2406 ff.). Other indications will be noted.

Various ways have been found to explain inconsistencies of this kind. One, now out of fashion, is to regard them as evidence of multiple authorship. Another is to assume corruption and remove the outstanding discrepancies by emendation: thus some editors altered *niwe* 2243 to *niwel*, supposed to mean 'deep down'. Another is to force the meaning of the

further trouble. Yet it is possible to make some sense of the last two lines if *gearwor* is taken to be attracted into the comparative in this context: 'Before (the fight) he had not really seen the Dragon's hoard, (?)rich in gold', i.e. he did not even know exactly what the treasure was for which he risked and gave his life. In fact, though the treasure was a main reason for seeking out the Dragon, Beowulf had seen only the stolen cup, and for the rest must rely on the report of a slave who had blundered into the dark den and fled in terror when he saw the Dragon asleep. This possibility gains something from the emphasis placed elsewhere on actually seeing the Hoard. Beowulf longs to have a good look at it (*gearo sceawian*) before he dies (2747 ff.); and his first sight of it is noted at 2285 f.: 'Frea sceawode | fira fyrngeweorc forman siðe': 'That was Beowulf's first sight of the cup made by men in old times.' The number of references to seeing or appraising the treasure is remarkable: *hord sceawian* 2744; *hord ys gesceawod* 3084; *neon sceawiað beagas ond brad gold* 3104 f.; *seon ond secean searo[gimma] geþræc* 3102; (*frætwa*) *þe ic her on starie* 2796.

<sup>1</sup> *Stapulas* 2718, *stanbogan* 2545, 2718; similarly *sess* 2717, 2756 could mean an artificial bench or a ledge serving as a seat.

words. Schücking, who favoured a natural cave, took *nive* to mean 'unused'.<sup>1</sup> Hoops, who had in mind a structure of the grave-mound type built (we need not inquire how) by the last survivor of his race,<sup>2</sup> took the stream that bursts from it to be the Dragon's breath, and he is followed by the latest editors. Before any of these ways of smoothing the text is adopted, a special cause of inconsistency should be considered. An old and widespread story of a hero's battle with a dragon who guarded treasure has been elaborated to make Beowulf's last adventure; and the latest poet's conception of the scenery may well have been superimposed on a different conception express or implicit in the version of the story he adapted: a natural cave and the chamber of an artificial grave-mound are both likely hiding-places for treasure.

The explanations mentioned so far assume that the work of one man will be consistent. That is a fair assumption for consecutive description or for matter vital to the main narrative. But *Beowulf* is a long discursive poem composed in a manner strongly influenced by the tradition of extempore verse. Details are introduced as they occur to the poet, so that inconsistencies are likely to arise in the composition and to escape the notice of listeners. The likelihood is increased by the characteristic imprecision of the language of Old English verse, where general terms are preferred, roughly synonymous expressions are accumulated, and compounds of vague meaning are freely used.<sup>3</sup> The aim is to stir the imagination by broad impressions or suggestions, not to guide it by a series of consistent images, sharply defined. For a poet using this style it was unnecessary, perhaps impossible, to think precisely about his scenery. *Beorh* can mean anything from the highest mountain or cliff to a tumulus perhaps no more than ten feet high; *beorh* and *hlæw* are both used of natural or of artificial eminences; both can mean the eminence itself or a cavity within it. So discrepancies in the scattered details of scenic description are to be expected.

<sup>1</sup> *Untersuchungen zur Bedeutungslehre der angelsächsischen Dichtersprache* (Heidelberg, 1915), p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> *Kommentar zum Beowulf* (Heidelberg, 1932), pp. 240, 244. But *stream* 2545 and *burna* 2546 are not used figuratively elsewhere in Old English verse, and there is nothing to suggest to a listener that they mean anything but 'water' here. *Brecan* 2546 is the proper verb for water bursting from the earth. I understand 2545-9 to describe the heat of the cave (of which the issuing stream was an indicator) when the Dragon was awake deep in his den; and 2556-8 *From ærest cwom oruð aglæcean*, &c., to describe what happened when he came out through the passage to the entrance.

<sup>3</sup> The point is well made by Schücking, *op. cit.*, pp. 6 ff. A scholar making a glossary, or a student making a translation, tries to assign a precise meaning to words like *neoro-cræftum* (*fæst*) 2243. The Anglo-Saxon who listened to *Beowulf* was free from this trouble, not because he could find the precise meaning in the moment of time available, but because he was satisfied with one or more of the suggestions conveyed—of confined spaces massively enclosed, of contrivance to make the hiding-place secure, &c.

Another characteristic of this kind of poetry<sup>1</sup> adds to the difficulty of forming a clear picture of the Dragon who guarded the Hoard, making his den in the cavity of the *hlæw* or *beorh*. The poet does not give pictorial descriptions of his 'persons' such as are common in Middle English. All we know of Beowulf's personal appearance is that it was outstanding when he was among good warriors (247 ff.). Of Grendel's mother we are told simply that she had the form of a giant woman (1351). When the occasion offers, a striking detail is sometimes given: while Grendel is alive the baleful glow of his eyes in the dark is noticed (726 f.); when his arm is exhibited as a trophy, the claw-like nails are described (984 ff.). There is rather more information about the Dragon, but on many points curiosity about his nature and shape is unsatisfied.

In recent years the character of the Dragon has been brought into prominence, and it is the more open to debate because the Dragon, like the other monsters in *Beowulf* and unlike the fiends of Christian legend, says nothing whatever. Professor Tolkien, in accordance with his general interpretation of the poem, calls him 'a personification of malice, greed, destruction (the evil side of heroic life), and of the indiscriminating cruelty of fortune that distinguishes not good or bad (the evil aspect of all life)'.<sup>2</sup> Mr. Gang, in his criticism of that general interpretation, invites sympathy for the Dragon, provoked by a thieving slave while carrying out his proper function:<sup>3</sup> 'a dragon lives in a mound, old and proud of his treasures'.<sup>4</sup> But can he be judged by moral or legal standards? Before Beowulf knew why the Dragon was devastating Geatland, he supposed it was a punishment sent by God for some wrong he had done unwittingly (2329 ff.); in other words, he regarded the Dragon as one of those natural forces—flood, tempest, fire—which from time to time wake and rage to destroy men and their works. The Dragon, unlike Grendel, has no ancestry, no companion. He seems to need no food. He appears out of the air to guard the Hoard when its last human owner is dead. He is ageless (*eald, wintrum frod*): he keeps the Hoard for 300 years (2278), and a remark of Wiglaf's suggests

<sup>1</sup> It is characteristic of the heroic tradition, not of Anglo-Saxon composition generally. Felix in his *Life of Guthlac* (ed. B. Colgrave (Cambridge, 1956), p. 130) describes the fiends who carried off the saint in vivid detail, from their big heads to their misshapen feet. For a description of an object clearly imagined, note the *Vision of Leofric* (ed. Napier, *Trans. Phil. Soc.* 1908, 186), where Earl Leofric sees a hand through a thick curtain: 'þa æteowde heo him swa swutole swa he his agene geseon mihte; 7 wæron fægere fingras smale 7 lange, 7 þæra nægla toscead 7 se greata lira beneoðan þam þuman—eall was gesyne—7 fram þam littlan fingran toward þæs earmes, 7 sumne dæl of þære slyfe': 'Then the hand appeared to him as clearly as he could see his own; the beautiful fingers were slender and long, and the outlines of the nails and the large fleshy part of the thumb—all was visible—and from the little finger up to the arm, and a part of the sleeve.'

<sup>2</sup> 'Beowulf, the Monsters, &c.', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* xxii (1936), 17.

<sup>3</sup> *R.E.S.*, n.s. iii (1952), 6 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Cotton Gnomics*, 26 f.

that he is not subject to natural death: 'We could not persuade our beloved King to let him be where he had been so long, until the end of the world' (3079 ff.). To this elemental creature popular imagination attributed one trait—a single-minded guardianship of his treasure, with no utilitarian motive: 'it profits him nothing', *ne byð him wihte ðy sel* 2277.

For Beowulf, a very practical hero, what mattered was the tangible body and fighting power of this fiery spirit. He is fifty feet long (3042 f.); of serpent not crocodile shape, because he coils himself and moves in coils (2567–9). He has wings, for he flies by night (2273, 2830 ff., &c.), but they are not specifically mentioned, although their disposition might have been of some importance in the fighting.<sup>1</sup> He is *nacod* (2273), which recent editors translate by 'smooth'—an unlikely adjective for a winged creature with a head on which the best of swords broke. It means 'bare-skinned', without any covering of hair, feathers, or the like. It would not exclude scales,<sup>2</sup> but there is no evidence of that conception in *Beowulf*. Our dragon has cruel venomous teeth (2692), and he breathes fire, perhaps through his nostrils only. One other all-important characteristic can be gathered from the action and from the analogy of the dragons killed by Sigurd and by Frotho:<sup>3</sup> head and back are invulnerable, but the underbelly is soft.

To take up the narrative. After the last survivor had died, a dragon found the Hoard *opene standan* (2271).<sup>4</sup> For 300 years he behaved as a conventional dragon, guarding his treasures, sleeping in the cave by day, flying out at night. Then somebody's slave, running away from severe punishment and needing shelter, came by chance upon the entrance, went in, saw the Dragon asleep, and, though terror-stricken, had the wits to slip out quietly, carrying with him a splendid cup from the treasure. He took this cup to his master, was pardoned (2281–5), and sent with the cup and

<sup>1</sup> Stopford Brooke, *English Literature . . . to the Norman Conquest* (1898), p. 78, and Thomas, *M.L.R.*, xxii (1927), 73, suppose he had feet because they take *biteran banum* 2692 to refer to claws; but a serpent's venom is in its fangs, and Saxo's dragons have a formidable bite. The silence of the text does not exclude the possibility that our Dragon had some kind of legs. There is, however, a slight indication to the contrary. He *stanc æfter stane* 2288, and usage seems to forbid the pleasing if incongruous image of this great winged serpent sniffing like a dog. Perhaps the rare verb was used to express the unusual motion of a snake, where *stōp*, which serves the metre as well, would imply walking.

<sup>2</sup> Aldhelm, *De Virginitate*, lii, describes a dragon as *squamosus*, echoing Virgil, *Georgics*, iv. 408 (I agree with Professor Tolkien, '*Beowulf*, &c.', p. 24, that there is no good evidence of knowledge of Virgil in *Beowulf*). Saxo's dragons are scaly, but he wrote much later, c. 1200, and his classical equipment was considerable.

<sup>3</sup> Saxo, *Historia Danorum*, ed. A. Holder, pp. 38 f.; cf. the dragon killed by Fridlevus at p. 181.

<sup>4</sup> On the view that the treasure was in a burial-mound, it has been supposed that an original barrier had fallen away, leaving the passage open. But a natural cave in the sea-cliff would always be open to a flying creature, and his comings and goings by night would not make it less secret.

his story to Beowulf, the King (2404 f.). The slave began the feud (2407). When the Dragon awakes it is carried a stage farther—*wroht wæs geniwað* (2287). He sees the footprints where the slave had stepped close to his head, searches outside the *hlæw* without success,<sup>1</sup> and, returning inside, finds that some man has stolen his cup. He can hardly restrain his rage until night. Then he flies out, blasting the countryside with his breath. He keeps up these night-raids, returning to his stronghold before dawn. Beowulf's own hall is burnt, and he decides to kill the Dragon and win the treasure.

The ultimate power of God or Destiny, often acknowledged in the poem, does not take from a man the responsibility for doing all he can, and Beowulf plans his fights thoughtfully. He will fight the Dragon single-handed, as Sigemund did (888): no one else is equal to the contest (2532 f.). He would prefer to rely on his bare hands, but can see no way of coming to handgrips with this fieriest of dragons (2518 ff.). To ward off the flame, which would burn up the usual wooden shield, he has an iron shield specially made (2337 ff.). Mailcoat and helmet will give a little protection against the heat, more against the Dragon's poisonous bite. And because cold steel is the bane of dragons, he will carry the sword *Nægling* and, hanging from his mailcoat, a *seax*<sup>2</sup> or long knife (2703 f.).

So armed, he sets out on a morning (cf. 2894), when he is sure to find the Dragon in his den, with eleven picked men as attendants, and the slave, who is taken much against his will, to show the way. No account is given of the journey, which seems to be short; so that it comes as a surprise when, after the fight, the messenger 'rode up over the ness' (*næs gerad* 2898) to report the result; but as this messenger is conjured up from nowhere for the convenience of the poet, who must keep Wiglaf beside Beowulf, we need not boggle at the horse. The topography is very vague. On the ness (2417) Beowulf sits down to make a long speech, in which he tells of his upbringing under Hrethel and his services to Hygelac; he recalls that he has survived many battles, says he is eager for this one, and ends 'I shall win the gold by valour or be slain in the fight'. Then, leaving his attendants on the high ground,<sup>3</sup> he goes down to the entrance at the foot of the

<sup>1</sup> Current editions read 2296-9:

hat ond hreohmod hlæw oft ymbbehwearf  
ealne utanwardne, ne ðær ænig mon  
on þære westenne; hwaðre wiges gefeh,  
beaduwe weorces, hwilum on beorh æthwearf . . .

Here *ænig mon* has no verb; *wiges* is substituted for MS. *hilde* to patch the alliteration; and the expression of 2298 is very abrupt. These three abnormalities point to a short lacuna after *westenne*, as Rieger first suggested.

<sup>2</sup> This becomes a *bill* to make the alliteration at 2777, another example of vague language.

<sup>3</sup> *Gebide ge on beorge*, &c., 2529 must mean 'wait here and see &c.', not 'come down with me and wait on the Dragon's barrow to see': that would be an unnecessarily dangerous place for spectators. This passage suits better with the conception of the Dragon's den as a natural cave at the foot of the sea-cliff.

cliffs (*under stanclœofu*). Arrived there, he finds that the heat inside the cave is unbearable (this explains why he cannot carry the fight into the Dragon's lair as he did with Grendel's mother). He shouts a challenge from the entrance. The Dragon, recognizing a man's voice, is provoked to come out, breathing fire. Beowulf stands ready, with shield and sword raised; and now that they are face to face, each realizes that the other is formidable (2564 f.).

The fight with Grendel could only be a single bout of wrestling in the dark, once Beowulf had secured his grip. The fight with Grendel's mother allowed of more variety and vicissitude: each wins a fall in wrestling; Beowulf tries two swords; Grendel's mother uses a *seax* as well as her nails. The Dragon-fight is in three rounds, clearly marked off by *oðre siðe* 2670 and *þriððan siðe* 2688. Each round represents an attack by the Dragon, against which Beowulf must stand firm, yielding no ground. He must contain the Dragon, for if he broke out, he could use his wings either to escape or to vary his attack, and Beowulf's men would be at his mercy. So Beowulf's promise to them that he would not retreat one foot (2525) may have a special significance.

In the first round the Dragon coils himself for the attack, then moves forward, breathing flame (2569). The performance of the iron shield, the novelty that was intended to counter the flame, is reported at once: it gave Beowulf's body and life good protection for a shorter time than he wished.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 2570-5:

	Scyld wel gebearg
life ond lice	læssan hwile
mærum þeodne	þonne his myne sohte
ðær he þy fyrste	forman dogore
wealdan moste	swa him wyrd ne gescraf
hreð æt hilde.	

The last part clearly means that Wyrd did not give Beowulf triumphant success in the battle (it will help if *hreð* here means something better than the victory won at the cost of his life). From *ðær* to *moste* I take to be a crux, i.e. a place for which a satisfactory explanation has not been found. Either the explanatory renderings proposed are themselves obscure or they assume unlikely meanings of well-known words. For instance *wealdan* has not been found in the sense 'spend (time)', which Chambers and Klaeber (3rd edn.) use. It does not mean 'live (the first day)', as Hoops translates: in the supposed parallel *Guthlac* 268 (239): *þara þe in gelimpe life weoldon* 'of those who lived their lives in prosperity', the sense 'live' comes out of *life*, and *weoldon* has something of the sense 'controlled', for these men lived as they wished. With or without an object *wealdan* can mean 'manage', but not in the modern sense 'make shift' under disadvantages. How could he 'manage' against Destiny, to whose ruling he has submitted (2526 f.)?

Up to and including *swa*, nearly every word in these three half lines is of doubtful meaning or construction; yet there is no obscure allusion and all are common words: the difficulty is to find one that is satisfying among the many combinations their ambiguity offers. That difficulty would be the same for an Anglo-Saxon. We must suppose that verses with no obvious meaning or poetic quality were composed by an accomplished poet and faithfully transmitted, or else that the transmission is faulty. Emendation is unpromising here because the general sense is uncertain; but any attempted emendation

Yet it did not fail altogether, since it still gave Beowulf and Wiglaf shelter from the flames in the last stage of the battle (2675). Perhaps the meaning is that no device, however ingenious, could save him when his death was settled by Wyrd. Next Beowulf brings his well-tried sword down on the bony head only to find that its edge will not bite. And now that the sword too has failed the audience are warned again that Beowulf will be killed.<sup>1</sup> If the Dragon was checked by the blow, it adds to his rage and the flames increase. He quickly presses his attack, so that Beowulf is enveloped in fire, without any help (2595 ff.). For at this stage his men, watching from above and thinking his case hopeless, run to a nearby wood to save themselves—all except his kinsman Wiglaf who, after trying to rally the others, breaks through the flame to help (2661 f.).

Fault has been found with the long account of Wiglaf (2599–630) and his speech calling the rest to their duty (2633–60) because they interrupt the description of the fight at an exciting moment.<sup>2</sup> I am not among the whole-hearted admirers of the construction of the poem, but would not count these passages heavily against them. Wiglaf, an important character, who is to prove himself a hero in the fight and to be the next king of the Geats, comes into the story at this point; and there is no better place to notice such relevant things as his youthfulness, the brave stock he comes from, his obligations to Beowulf, and the history of the sword with which he makes victory against the Dragon possible. It is debatable whether the

should give one plain meaning: for instance, if *his* were added before *þy fyrste*, the meaning would be unmistakable, apart from a doubt about the exact force of *stua*: 'where (or when) he had to use it (*sc.* the untried iron shield) for the first day on this occasion, under the condition that Destiny did not give him triumphant success'.

<sup>1</sup> Taking *grundwong þone* 2588 as 'the earth', not 'the place where he stood to fight', for that would mean that he broke his word (2525). This form of half verse, with a heavy disyllabic compound followed by the acc. sg. masc. of the definite article postponed, is found only in the latter part of *Beowulf* (not elsewhere in the poetry): 2007 *uhtlēm þone*; 2334 *eorðweard þone*; 2969 *wælhlem þone*; 3081 *goldweard þone*; and the equivalent 2959 *freoðowong þone*. The article is not necessarily emphatic.

<sup>2</sup> The tone of Wiglaf's short speech to Beowulf (2663–8) has also been criticized. But would it seem inappropriate to an Anglo-Saxon audience used to the 'high style'? Men were accustomed to encourage (*byldan*) one another in desperate fights, as in *Maldon* 209 ff.; and it was not the privilege of leaders or seniors: when Waldere was fighting against great odds, Hildegyth, to whom he was betrothed, urged him not to let his courage fail that day (*Waldere*, i. 6 f.). Wiglaf is the only one who can make the encouraging speech because Beowulf intends to win alone or die; and he follows custom when he reminds Beowulf of an old promise (2664 ff.), for we see from *Maldon* 212 f. that appeals to a previous undertaking (*gylp*, *beot*) had a heartening effect. *Gylp* is usually translated 'boast', but like *gylpwide*, *gylpword*, it can mean a man's declaration that he will do something requiring high courage, without the bad connotation of 'boast'. In effect it was a vow that kept the maker up to the mark when he remembered it or was reminded of it. So when Beowulf says (2527 f.) that he will do without *gylp*: 'ic eom on mode from | þæt ic wið þone guðflogan gylp ofersitte', his meaning seems to be 'I am eager to fight, so that I make no vow against the Dragon (to hold me to my purpose)'. Yet the same speech contains more than one undertaking that could be called *gylp*.

introduction of the men who ran away is happy, as a matter of form. But *Beowulf* has a strong didactic element: it is a 'mirror' of noble conduct, in which contrasted examples of good and bad conduct are often shown. If the ten who failed in their leader's great need are introduced at all, it can only be at this point and space must be given to their failure. After all, the medium is heroic narrative, not drama.

As soon as Wiglaf is in position beside his King, the Dragon's second attack (*oðre siðe* 2670) falls on him. The Dragon comes on with waves of fire;<sup>1</sup> Wiglaf's wooden shield is burnt to the metal boss, his mailcoat gives no protection against the heat, but he continues to fight behind Beowulf's iron shield. Then Beowulf brings Nægling down with all his might on the Dragon's head, and the sword, proved in so many battles, breaks: no sword could bear Beowulf's full strength. The poet's summing up of this second round understates his plight: 'he was no better off'—*næs him wihte ðe sel* 2687.

At his third onset (*þriððan siðe* 2688) the Dragon has an immediate success: with his poisonous teeth he gets a grip of Beowulf's neck, a vital part in the gap between helmet and mailcoat; the life-blood (*sawuldrior*) flows in waves. And now Wiglaf proves his quality. The breathless sentence that describes his action cannot be analysed exactly, but the meaning is plain: he did not strike at the head, which was too hard even for Beowulf's sword-stroke, but somewhat lower down (*nioðor hæene*), so that his sword penetrated and the fiery breathing began to slacken. *Nioðor* does not mean nearer the tail, but farther from the hard back, nearer the soft underpart; and the Dragon's breathing slackened much as the blast from a smith's bellows would slacken if the leather was pierced.

The reference to the burning of Wiglaf's hand,<sup>2</sup> awkwardly introduced by *ac*, is the more noteworthy because in *Beowulf* little interest is shown in minor wounds. It points, I think, to the Dragon's tactics throughout the fight. He exposed his invulnerable skull and back while manœuvring so that his fiery breath prevented an attack on his vulnerable underparts. Beowulf wasted two sword-strokes, not because he was ignorant, but because he could not get at the softer parts. Wiglaf, unless he aimed at the head, must reach out from behind the iron shield and expose his bare hand to the flames in order to strike 'somewhat lower down'. And the final act suits this interpretation. As soon as the flames eased, Beowulf, mortally

<sup>1</sup> Professor J. C. Pope, *The Rhythm of Beowulf* (New Haven, 1942), p. 320, divides the words and lines convincingly at 2672 f.

ligyðum for;

born bord wið rond, . . .

<sup>2</sup> 2697 f.: Ne hedde he þæs heafolan ac sio hand gebarn  
modiges mannes þær he his mæges healp &c.

The *ac* clause can be conveniently translated as a parenthesis.

# SISAM: BEOWULF'S FIGHT WITH THE DRAGON 139

wounded but still conscious and resourceful (2703), drew the *seax* that hung ready to his hand, *forwrat* . . . *wyrm on middan*, and the Dragon was finished: 'together the royal kinsmen had destroyed him' (2707 f.).

What exactly did Beowulf do? The verb *forwritan* is not recorded elsewhere, so there is some liberty of interpretation. Modern editions seem to agree that he cut the Dragon in two through the middle. Even if Beowulf were not mortally wounded, it would be an incredible as well as an unnecessary feat to reach to the middle of this great creature and cut it through with a *seax*, perhaps a foot long overall. Sheer extravagance was not pleasing to Anglo-Saxon taste. Besides, the Dragon is noticed again at 2903, *seaxbennum seoc*; at 3038 ff. its dead body is described as fifty feet long and scorched by its own fire; at 3131 f. it is pushed into the sea: nowhere is there a suggestion that it was in two pieces. Saxo's verses on Frotho's dragon are enlightening:

Tela licet temnat vis squamea, ventre sub imo  
Esse locum scito quo ferrum mergere fas est;  
Hunc mucrone petens *medium rimaberis* anguem.<sup>1</sup>

Beowulf stabbed and ripped with his knife somewhere along the middle line of the soft throat and belly, and so let out the life instantly. An audience familiar with dragon-lore would know that when Wiglaf struck *niðor hwene*, 'somewhat lower down', the wound was not final (that is the significance of *hwene*), and that when Beowulf struck *on middan* the Dragon was dead (that is why the fighting ends abruptly with these words).

The fight ends almost exactly half-way through the third part of *Beowulf*. At one place or another in the trailing latter half the poet conscientiously tidies up the ends. Beowulf, tended by Wiglaf and comforted by the sight of as much of the treasure as Wiglaf can carry out to him (cf. 3090-3), makes two dying speeches, in the course of which he appoints Wiglaf his successor, commends the people to his care, and asks that their memorial to him should be a barrow high on Hronesnæs (not Earnanæs, the scene of the fight) which seafarers coming from afar will use as a landmark and call 'Beowulf's Barrow' (2802 ff.). The ten who ran to the wood come out of their shelter, ashamed, and are told by Wiglaf that they are dishonoured always and everywhere (2884-91). Then he reports to the people and leads the preparations for a magnificent funeral. The Dragon's carcass is pushed into the sea (3131-3). The great Hoard that Beowulf won for his people is used to honour him. It is taken by wagon to Hronesnæs (3134-6); some of it may have been burnt on his funeral pyre (3137-40, cf. 3010-17); but most was buried in his barrow (3163 ff.): a great treasure to honour a great king was the pagan thought. 'It still lies there, as useless to men as it

<sup>1</sup> Loc. cit.

## 140 SISAM: BEOWULF'S FIGHT WITH THE DRAGON

was before': that is the comment of the Anglo-Saxon church, to be interpreted 'it would have been better spent in prayers and alms'.<sup>1</sup>

My purpose has been to examine the subject-matter where the meaning of the text is clear enough, and to test the congruity of details. The result seems to me to be that the background of scenery and previous history is often vague or inconsistent, but that the account of the central incident, the fight itself, will bear close examination and gain from it. The man who worked out its details, all fiction, realized them clearly; and if the poet of *Beowulf* found all or some of them in his source, he followed them understandingly. It is a fair inference that the audience for whom the poem was composed were alert and critical when the fighting was described: they were not content with vague impressions, but wanted details and wanted them to be well knit. This special interest in fighting is confirmed by the subjects of the principal Anglo-Saxon secular poems: *Beowulf*, *Finn Fragment*, *Waldere*, *Brunanburh*, *Maldon*.

<sup>1</sup> 3167 f. MS.:

gold on greote    þær hit nu gen lifað  
eldum swa unnyt    swa hit æror wæs;

But I have translated *ligeð* and propose to read it for MS. *lifað*. The commentators pass over the difficulty. The very common verb *libban* or *lifian* means 'live': it is not used of inanimate things, of which metals are typical, to mean 'exist', and there is no question of personification here. So *lifað* gives a wrong sense: why should the poet endow gold with life when it is quite inert—long since buried and undisturbed—and the story is finished? *Licgan* is used of the same treasures at 3129 *læne licgan* (where *læne* does not mean that the objects are perishable—gold isn't—but that human ownership of them is short and precarious). *Licgan* also means 'lie dead', and *libbende* and *licgende* are used to cover live and 'dead' stock. Metal money was 'dead' stock, so that in *Orosius*, ed. Sweet, p. 116/32, *hie ðær nan licgende feoh ne metten* translates 'auri atque argenti nihil repertum'; see also C. T. Onions, 'Die and Live', *R.E.S.*, N.S. vi i(1956), 174-6. The association of opposites must be reckoned with in textual criticism.

## TWO TREATISES BY THOMAS DIGGES

By FRANCIS R. JOHNSON

WHEN at the British Museum Library in the spring of 1950, I called to the attention of the Superintendent of the Reading Room the fact that two pamphlets listed both in the British Museum Catalogue and in Pollard and Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue* under Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, were actually written by Thomas Digges (?1546-95), the famous Elizabethan mathematician and astronomer who was Mustermaster General on Leicester's staff during the wars in the Netherlands. The pamphlets are:

1. *A Briefe Report of the Militarie Services done in the Low Countries, by the Erle of Leicester: written by one that serued in good place there in a letter to a friend of his.* (Imprinted at London, by Arnold Hatfield, for Gregorie Seton, 1587.) [S.T.C. No. 7285.]

2. *A Briefe and true report of the Proceedings of the Earle of Leycester for the reliefe of the Towne of Sluce, from his arriuall at Vlisshing, about the end of Iune 1587. vntill the surrendrie thereof 26. Julij next ensuing. Whereby it shall plainelie appeare his Excellencie was not in anie fault for the losse of that Towne.* (London: [T. Orwin,] 1590.) [S.T.C. No. 7284.]

During the following eighteen months two articles appeared, each conjecturing—primarily on the basis of style and internal evidence—that Thomas Digges was the actual author of the pamphlets:

(1) Louise Patterson, 'Leonard and Thomas Digges: Biographical Notes', *Isis*, xlii (1951), 120-1; and (2) Henry J. Webb, 'Two Additions to the Military Bibliography of Thomas Digges', *Modern Language Quarterly*, xii (1951), 131-3.<sup>1</sup>

Naturally, I fully agree with the conclusions of Miss Patterson and Mr. Webb, but the case for Thomas Digges's authorship is much stronger than either is able to present. Inasmuch as the authorities of the British Museum Library made in 1950 a note in the catalogue ascribing the authorship to Thomas Digges and this ascription is on the point of being printed in the new *British Museum Catalogue*, it now seems urgent that the evidence should be published in full.

I shall consider the second of these two pamphlets first, because the evidence in the case of S.T.C. No. 7284 is clear and unequivocal. The

<sup>1</sup> The only conclusion to be inferred from this coincidence is that three persons, working independently, arrived at the same conclusion at about the same time.

treatise is a lucid and convincing defence of Leicester's unsuccessful campaign to relieve the town of Sluce and was clearly intended as an additional appendix to the second (1590) edition of Thomas Digges's *Stratioticos*; in the Bodleian copy of the 1590 *Stratioticos* (Antiq. e. E. 1590 (3)) it is, in fact, bound at its proper place in the volume. Since the second edition of the *Stratioticos* was, as we would say today, 'privately printed' for Thomas Digges himself,<sup>1</sup> he no doubt meant this pamphlet to be sold with the *Stratioticos* to complete that book.

The pamphlet begins (sigs. A2-A3) with an address 'To the Reader concerning this Addition of the honorable endeavors of the Earle of Leicester, for the reliefe of Sluce', in which the author mentions that

finding yet in my hands a briefe and true revelation of his Excellencies honorable endeavours upon her Majesties gracious great and extraordinarie charges to relieve that Towne (by me even at that time committed to writing, when these matters were in Action, and my self present both at the Consultations and Executions:) I have thought it my duetie likewise herewith to Print and publish the same, that neither the Honourable Patron of this Treatise now dead, by injurious imputations be unjustlie wronged, nor the world seduced, to thinke the Swanne a Crowe, or the Dawe an Eagle.

Then follows (A4<sup>r</sup>-B4<sup>v</sup>) the text of 'A true report of his Excellencies careful proceedings, for the reliefe of Sluce, as it was briefly set downe while the matter was in action', giving a matter-of-fact chronicle of the events of the campaign, and ending with the conclusion:

neither can I imagine what was possible for any Generall . . . to do more than his Excellencie hath done; whatsoever common opinion (led onelie with bare events) may conceive of it.

The text, in all important particulars, is identical with that of the versions in MS. Cotton Galba D I, fols. 203 ff. and 221 ff., which are entitled 'A briefe memoriall of the proceedings touching the succour of fluiice as well before his Excellencies arriving here in the Low Countries as after', and are endorsed in the upper left corner of the first folio: 'Belgia 1587 July'. Since the context makes clear that the treatise was written for Leicester by an important member of his military staff, it was not appropriate that the signature of the author of this staff report should appear at the end of the document, nor in the copies that Leicester forwarded to the Privy Council with a covering letter dated from Dort 21 August 1587.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See MS. Lansdowne 69, f. 17. I plan to publish in the volume of studies honouring Professor F. P. Wilson, scheduled to appear in 1958, a discussion of this and related manuscripts and their revelations concerning book publishing in the age of Elizabeth.

<sup>2</sup> S.P. 84/17/130: the enclosures headed: 'A breif report of the proceedings of his Excellencie for the releif of the town of Sluyce, until the surrender thereof 26 Julij Anno. 1587' are listed as S.P. 84/17/131 ff. Another copy is at fols. 141 ff.

Moreover, the next item in the pamphlet of 1590 is entitled 'Another addition concerning certaine chiefe Officers of an Armie. Wherein by Conference of the repugnant conditions in the Good and Bad, both the Officers themselves may the better knowe and indeavour to perfourme their duties' (C1<sup>r</sup>). The text that follows contrasts, in parallel columns, the qualities of the 'Good and the Bad Mustermaster' (C2<sup>r</sup>-C3<sup>v</sup>); of the good and bad 'Pagadores or Militarie Treasurers' (C3<sup>v</sup>-D1<sup>v</sup>); of the good and bad 'Auditors' (D1<sup>v</sup>-D3<sup>r</sup>). The subsequent item (D3<sup>v</sup>-E1<sup>v</sup>) is entitled 'Abuses that may be practized to the great dishonour of the Prince, the defrauding of soldiers and honest Creditours: and utter ruine and confusion of an Armie, wher they shall be continued, and not prevented'. Then (E2<sup>r</sup>-E2<sup>v</sup>) comes a section on 'The onely or best salve to recure such ulcerous sores'.

The manuscript for the text of this 1590 pamphlet, from C1<sup>r</sup> to the end on E2<sup>v</sup>, is present, and in exactly the same order, in MS. Cotton Galba C VIII, fols. 263-6. At the end of the section on 'Auditors' (fol. 265<sup>v</sup>) is the autograph 'Tho. Digges'. The signature of Thomas Digges again appears at the end (fol. 266<sup>v</sup>).

So much for the direct evidence of Thomas Digges's authorship of the appendixes to his *Stratoticos* which are printed, listed in the *Short-Title Catalogue* as No. 7284.

Turning now to pamphlet (1), *S.T.C.* No. 7285, we find that although there is no manuscript with Thomas Digges's signature to clinch the case for his authorship, the circumstantial evidence is overwhelming. First, two of the surviving copies—(a) the Britwell copy (now British Museum, pressmark C. 38. e. 41), and (b) the Holkham Hall copy (now Bodleian Library, pressmark Holk. e. 7)—represent a separate issue in which the letter to the friend of the author, concluding: 'At London the 8. of Januarie 1586', adds at the bottom of sig. E2<sup>r</sup>, 'Your worships humble in all service, T. D.'. Other copies, including the British Museum copy (C. 32. d. 2.) and the copies in the Folger and Huntington Libraries, are printed from the same setting of type; they differ from the Britwell and Holkham Hall copies only in lacking the addition of a complimentary close signed 'T. D.' at the bottom of the final page.

Who, then, is the 'T. D.' that signs this letter, and who 'The Right Worshipful my especial good friende, Sir I. A. knight' to whom T. D. writes: to

satisfie [his] often earnest requestes, I have taken time these holidiaes to set you downe a brieft report of the militarie seruices done in the lowe Countries by the Earle of Leicester, during the time of his abode and government there: reckening from the 22. day of January 1585. on which day he was receiued Governour of those Countries; till the 23. of Nouember 1586. when he embarked at Vlushing, in his returne for England (A 3<sup>r</sup>)?

Clearly this pamphlet may best be described as a succinct military staff report of the first nine months of Leicester's campaign in the Netherlands. The writer tells us that he was present in person at the events he records and took part in the related staff consultations. The initials 'T. D.' are an important clue. Although there were other 'T. D.'s in the wars in the Netherlands—and other Thomas Diggeses, nephews and cousins of Thomas Digges the astronomer and mathematician—the only person bearing those initials holding a high position on Leicester's military staff was his Mustermaster General, Thomas Digges, the mathematician. An earlier conjecture, that the author was Thomas Dannet (who translated many works, chiefly historical, from Dutch into English and dedicated them to Leicester), must be dismissed, for there is no evidence that Dannet ever held an important post on Leicester's military staff. Furthermore, the times, places, and sequence of events described in 'T. D.'s letter agree with the recorded movements of Thomas Digges in the Netherlands campaign, as attested in the letters by and to Thomas Digges still preserved in the Lansdowne and Cotton collections of manuscripts in the British Museum and the manuscripts in the Public Record Office.<sup>1</sup> For example, these documents show that Thomas Digges returned with Leicester to England on 23 November 1586. Thus he was back in England during the holidays of December 1586 and January 1586/7. Recall that the letter written to his friend during the 'holiedaies' is dated 'At London the 8. of Januarie 1586 [1587]'.

The next link in the evidence for Thomas Digges's authorship concerns the identification of the friend, Sir I. [J.] A. knight, to whom the letter was written. MS. Lansdowne 678, 'A Catholog of all the Knights Dubbed in the tyme of Q. Elizabeth drawne into an Alphabet' records (p. 2) a 'John Arondell' as knighted in 1566, and another of the same name in 1585.<sup>2</sup> The person knighted in 1566 was probably Sir John Arundell of Lanherne (1527–90).<sup>3</sup> The lifelong record of Catholic allegiance of the Arundells of Lanherne makes it highly unlikely that he was Digges's friend and correspondent. The dates of the Sir Johns in the family of the Arundells of Trerice do not fit the requirements. The John Arundel knighted in 1585 is certainly Sir John Arundel of Tolverne, who like the Arundells of Trerice was from a family of Protestant cousins of the Catholic Arundells of

<sup>1</sup> See S.P. 84/1 to 5 *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> Two candidates for the Sir J. A. were previously tested; at first each had seemed likely because of his association with Digges and his friends. The first, Sir John Astley, son and heir of John Astley, Esq., Master of the Jewel House under Queen Elizabeth, had to be rejected because he was not knighted until thirteen years after 1587. The second, Sir John Ashburnham of Ashburnham, was not knighted until 1604 (William A. Shaw, *Knights of England*).

<sup>3</sup> John Pym Yeatman, *History of the House of Arundel* (London, 1882), p. 215; and J. L. Vivian, *The Visitations of Cornwall* (London, 1887), p. 4.

Lanherne.<sup>1</sup> This John Arundel of Tolverne was master of one of the ships on the first Virginia voyage of 1585 under Sir Richard Grenville. It was he who on 5 September 1585 was dispatched in the *Tiger* for England, Sir Richard Grenville following in a captured Spanish prize on 25 September. The *Tiger* arrived at Falmouth on 6 October,<sup>2</sup> and John Arundel of Tolverne was knighted by Queen Elizabeth at Richmond on 14 October 1585.<sup>3</sup>

Thomas Digges's friendship with Sir John Arundel of Tolverne was founded upon community of interests, such as navigation and colonization, and the connexion of both men with Sir Richard Grenville. The father of Grenville's wife was Sir John St. Leger; whereas Thomas Digges had married Agnes, the daughter of Sir Warham St. Leger, the cousin of Sir John.<sup>4</sup> In a letter to Sir Francis Walsingham dated 23 June 1584 Thomas Digges refers to Grenville as 'my good friend and Allied Kinsman'.<sup>5</sup>

Probably the Thomas Arundel to whom, according to Hasted,<sup>6</sup> Thomas Digges in 1573 alienated the manor of Wootton was the member of the Trerice branch of the family stated by Halliday to have followed the Netherlands wars.<sup>7</sup>

The third link in the evidence for Thomas Digges's authorship of *S.T.C.* No. 7285 is to be sought in the printer of the volume, Arnold Hatfield. Why was Hatfield selected as printer? If the author of the treatise was Thomas Digges, the choice can be readily explained. Thomas Digges's principal works, the *Pantometria* (1571) and the *Stratiticos* (1579), had both been printed by Henry Bynneman. When Thomas Digges returned to London from the Netherlands at the end of 1586, Bynneman, the printer with whom he had formerly dealt, was dead. Bynneman's type, initials, and other equipment had been purchased by a syndicate headed by Arnold Hatfield.<sup>8</sup> This group had its printing office in the district of London known as the 'Old Bailey'. At this period Thomas Digges's London residence was in the same district.<sup>9</sup> The power both of old associations and of present convenience would combine to lead Thomas Digges, looking for a printer for a new treatise, straight to Arnold Hatfield.

<sup>1</sup> Vivian, op. cit., p. 6, states that Sir John Arundel of Tolverne was born in 1550; he married Anna, the daughter of Thomas Godolphin.

<sup>2</sup> A. L. Rowse, *Sir Richard Grenville of the Revenge* (London, 1937), p. 216.

<sup>3</sup> Shaw, *Knights*, ii. 84.

<sup>4</sup> Rowse, *Grenville*, p. 58; and W. Berry, *County Genealogies (Kent)*, pp. 143, 287. [Berry gives Sir Warham St. Leger's eldest daughter's name as 'Anne', in error for Agnes.]

<sup>5</sup> S.P. 12/171/112<sup>b</sup>. I owe this reference to my friend A. L. Rowse, whose help was invaluable in tracing the interrelations of the various families of Arundels in Cornwall.

<sup>6</sup> *History of Kent*, ix. 366.

<sup>7</sup> F. E. Halliday, *Richard Carew of Antony: The Survey of Cornwall* (London, 1953), p. 312.

<sup>8</sup> R. B. McKerrow, *Dictionary of Printers and Booksellers in England, 1557-1640* (London, 1910), p. 131.

<sup>9</sup> See MS. Lansdowne 69, f. 17.

## SOME LINES FROM POPE

By RALPH N. MAUD

ONE of Pope's most delightful poems is his 'Coronation Epistle', the familiar verse letter included in the first edition of his works (1717) immediately after 'To a Young Lady with the Works of Voiture' and entitled 'To the Same, on her Leaving the Town after the Coronation'.<sup>1</sup> Fifty-two years after its publication (twenty-five years after Pope's death) Owen Ruffhead announced that the original draft of the poem ended with sixteen additional lines: 'In these the poet humorously describes the manner in which the *beau Esprits* spent their time in town. But on reflection he thought proper to suppress these lines.'<sup>2</sup> The editors of the Twickenham Edition with some hesitation admitted the lines into Pope's canon on the strength of a printed version of 1775 and the report by W. J. Courthope of a second transcript.<sup>3</sup> The lines seem clearly to be Pope's; who but Pope has written couplets as balanced, as compact, and as funny as these?

In this strange Town a different Course we take,  
Refine ourselves to Spirit, for your Sake.  
For Want of you, we spend our random Wit on  
The first we find with Needham, Brooks, or Briton.  
Hackney'd in Sin, we beat about the Town,  
And like sure Spaniels, at first Scent lie down.  
Were Virtue's self in Silks,—faith keep away!  
Or Virtue's Virtue scarce would last a Day.

Thus, Madam, most Men talk, and some Men do:  
The rest is told you in a Line or two.  
Some strangely wonder you're not fond to marry—  
A double Jest still pleases sweet Sir Harry—  
Small-Pox is rife, and Gay in dreadful fear—  
The good Priests whisper—Where's the Chevalier?  
Much in your Absence B—'s Heart endures,  
And if poor *Pope* is cl-pt, the Fault is yours.

The use of his name in the last line is almost as good as a signature.

But how *risqué* the compliment is! The lady's powers, according to this sly tribute, are so great that the poet has to make drastic compensation for

<sup>1</sup> The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope, vi, *Minor Poems*, ed. Norman Ault and John Butt (London and New Haven, 1954), uses a title based on the 1735 printing: 'Epistle To Miss Blount, on her leaving the Town, after the Coronation' (p. 124).

<sup>2</sup> *The Life of Alexander Pope* (1769), p. 405 n.

<sup>3</sup> *Minor Poems*, pp. 232 f.

her absence. Except for the anonymous compiler of the 1776 *Additions to Pope*, only Warton among Pope's editors felt able to print it.<sup>1</sup> The problem is aesthetic: the virginal Coronation Epistle has, we are told, a lecherous ending. This conjunction involves a lapse of decorum that few would be willing to attribute to Pope; I propose that we need not do so.

Ruffhead's reliability may be judged by two other instances in which he claims to have come upon a genuine Pope manuscript previously unknown to the public. In the first case, a 'copy of verses, which have never yet been printed, and for which the public is indebted to the honourable Mr. Yorke',<sup>2</sup> the public's debt is perhaps not too burdensome in view of the fact that the poem could be found in Vol. IV of Aaron Hill's *Works* (1753), reprinted from Hill's own periodical, *The Prompter*.<sup>3</sup> The second case is 'To Belinda, upon the Rape of the Lock', by Pope, which Ruffhead presents as the work of an anonymous imitator of Pope, 'never yet . . . made public'.<sup>4</sup> Since this poem had appeared in *Poems on Several Occasions* (1717),<sup>5</sup> the manuscript Ruffhead relied on was as misleading as Mr. Yorke's—or else Ruffhead himself was making wild guesses.

While we have no way of contradicting Ruffhead's statement that the sixteen 'suppressed' lines 'immediately follow the last line of the printed copy',<sup>6</sup> when Courthope examined Warburton's papers he found merely a copy of the sixteen lines *unattached*: 'Lines at the conclusion of Mr. Pope's verses to Mrs. M. B. on her leaving town.' The copyist 'R. G.' notes that 'the following were taken from Mr. Pope's original MS., and were never printed', and adds at the end 'Copia vera'.<sup>7</sup> Though this transcript has apparently disappeared, if it was in the Warburton papers when Warburton died in 1779 it was most probably in the papers that Ruffhead used for his biography in 1769, and so was Ruffhead's 'original copy', the sole authority for his comment. R. G.'s transcript would hardly have been made or preserved if a 'complete' poem had existed in the papers. We can admit that Ruffhead had an 'original copy' of the Coronation Epistle proper (he gives a variant for l. 7) without admitting that the sixteen lines were in the same manuscript. Robert Carruthers also gives a variant for l. 7—a different variant, which indicates that more than one 'original' of the Epistle existed;<sup>8</sup> but he makes no mention of suppressed lines. The only recorded contemporary transcript, B.M. MS. Stowe 970 (ff. 73<sup>v</sup>–74<sup>v</sup>), has only the fifty lines of the Epistle proper.

R. G.'s testimony about the sixteen lines is seemingly unequivocal; but nevertheless, when he refers to 'Mr. Pope's original MS.' there is no

<sup>1</sup> *Works*, ii (1797), 363.

<sup>2</sup> *Life*, pp. 408 f.

<sup>3</sup> See *Minor Poems*, p. 458.

<sup>4</sup> *Life*, p. 131.

<sup>5</sup> See *Minor Poems*, p. 109.

<sup>6</sup> *Life*, p. 405 n.

<sup>7</sup> *The Works of Alexander Pope*, ed. Whitwell Elwin and William John Courthope (1881), iii. 223 f.

<sup>8</sup> *Works* (1853), ii. 279.

assurance that it was not a separate draft of the sixteen lines. Moreover, the connexion with the Coronation Epistle is possibly R. G.'s own guess: an ascription 'to Mrs. M. B.' could not have come from any early draft of Pope's, because Martha Blount, it is unanimously agreed, was not the original addressee; indeed, Pope never specified Martha at all, even when the title became 'To Miss Blount' in the 1735 edition.

The printing of the 'suppressed' lines in the *St. James's Chronicle* of 10-12 August 1775 gives no further clue to the manuscript source. An introductory letter states:

Sir, The enclosed Lines were transcribed from the Original, in the Handwriting of Mr. Pope. They were added after the present Conclusion of his Address to Miss M. B. on her leaving Town. 'As some fond Virgin, &c.' I heartily wish I could apologize for their Licentiousness as easily as I can prove their Authenticity. I am, Sir, Your most humble Servant. G. R.<sup>1</sup>

G. R. parrots R. G., and there is nothing to convince us that in this printing we have any other than the R. G. manuscript, especially since Courthope indicates that the two are verbally the same.<sup>2</sup> The *St. James's Chronicle* has only an average score—one right, one wrong, one possible—in its attribution of poems to Pope.<sup>3</sup>

It is, then, possible that this genuine Pope fragment has come down to us mistakenly assigned; and its incompatibility with the Coronation Epistle makes this in fact very probable. It is difficult even to begin to compare Zephalinda of the Epistle and the 'Madam' of the additional lines without labouring the point that they are different people. Zephalinda is likened to a virgin who has just barely recognized her natural charms, and her flirtation with the Squire is completely innocent; 'Madam', on the other hand, is expected to relish the *double-entendre* of, say,

Hackney'd in Sin, we beat about the Town,  
And like sure Spaniels, at first Scent lie down;

and to recognize as a compliment that when she leaves town her male acquaintances have to find solace in houses such as Needham's.<sup>4</sup> The poet's compliment to Zephalinda is complete when he portrays himself as interrupted in his devotional day-dreaming by the town's 'streets, chairs, and coxcombs'. For him to be sexually frustrated by the lady's absence is not part of the Zephalinda compliment, or, in other words, is a compliment to someone else.

While the first eight of the 'suppressed' lines give a semi-fictional

<sup>1</sup> *Minor Poems*, p. 232.

<sup>2</sup> Elwin-Courthope, iii. 223 f.

<sup>3</sup> See *Minor Poems*, pp. 296, 462, 440.

<sup>4</sup> Needham is mentioned in the *Dunciad* and *Sober Advice from Horace*. Brooks and Briton are unidentified.

situation essentially different from the tender longing of the Epistle proper, the second eight lines are even farther removed: they break with the fictional altogether. One is compelled to read them as separate items of gossip such as might be crowded at the end of a chatty letter: 'The rest is told you in a Line or two', the 'rest' being observations on the state of affairs since the lady's departure. Significantly, none of these news items refers to the Coronation. They are personal allusions, effective only among people 'in the know', e.g. the little taunt about marriage, quite alien to the Zephalinda episode. Sir Harry is unidentified, but he is obviously a mutual acquaintance, a real Sir Harry. Gay is good for a chuckle among friends. The allusions to small-pox and the Chevalier are topical.<sup>1</sup> Whether the *B*— is Bethel, Brocas, or Bathurst, the point is that we are forced into biography because the lines are patently non-fiction.

Though the Coronation Epistle proper does not in this way force us out of its fictional mode, we do know that Zephalinda and Parthenia (or rather the 'Parthenissa' of earlier printings) were the pet names of Teresa and Martha Blount, that Martha—if not Teresa too—missed the Coronation because of illness, and that therefore the poem reflects an actual situation in which Pope was involved.<sup>2</sup> The sixteen 'suppressed' lines take us into a quite different milieu, perhaps specifically the retinue of the Prince of Wales, the apparent audience for such poems in manuscript as 'A Farewell to London' (c. May 1715) and 'The Court Ballad' (December 1716). Like the 'suppressed' lines, these poems have specific references, topical allusions, and comic poetic effects; and they are fictional, likewise, precisely in that Pope pretends to be more of a rake than he actually was. For instance, in 'A Farewell to London':

Dear, dam'd, distracting Town, farewell!

Thy Fools no more I'll teize:

This Year in Peace, ye Critics, dwell,

Ye Harlots, sleep at Ease!

Soft *B* - - - and rough *C* - - - s, adieu!

Earl *Warwick* make your Moan,

The lively *H* - - - k and you

May knock up Whores alone.<sup>3</sup>

These stanzas and the 'suppressed' lines share a subject-matter, an unidentified 'B - - -', and a French rhyme-word, *adieu*: *you* (cf. *Chevalier*: *fear*).

'The Court Ballad' is especially worthy of attention because it is

<sup>1</sup> *The Correspondence of Alexander Pope*, ed. George Sherburn (Oxford, 1956), i. 235,

311.

<sup>2</sup> See Norman Ault, *New Light on Pope* (London, 1949), pp. 58-59.

<sup>3</sup> *Minor Poems*, p. 128.

addressed to three ladies-in-waiting to Princess Caroline, and shows what Pope was capable of writing to ladies of a certain kind. It begins:

To one fair Lady out of court  
And two fair Ladies in  
Who think the Turk and Pope a sport  
And Wit and Love no Sin,  
Come these soft lines, with nothing Stiff in  
To B[ellende]n L[epe]ll and G[riffi]n  
With a fa.

What passes in the dark third row  
And what behind the Scene,  
Couches and cripple Chairs I know,  
And Garret hung with green;  
I know the Swing of sinful Hack,  
Where many a Damsel cries oh lack.  
With a fa.<sup>1</sup>

'Sinful Hack' is a striking echo of 'Hackney'd in Sin' of the 'suppressed' lines. Here too we have Pope mentioning himself by name. The comic rhyme, *Stiff in: Griffin*, where two words (noun plus preposition) rhyme with the name of a person, is exactly what we had in *Wit on: Briton*. Nothing like this comic rhyming appears in the formal epistles; indeed very few feminine endings are found at this time except in these *risqué* poems: the Coronation Epistle has only two sets of feminine endings in fifty lines—and it is more light-hearted than most—but 'The Court Ballad', about the same length, has seven sets, and the 'suppressed' sixteen lines have two sets, both for extreme comic effect.

Perhaps the 'suppressed' lines, then, are the end of a verse letter to one of the ladies-in-waiting? Pope knew Mary Bellenden and Mary (or Molly) Lepell intimately.<sup>2</sup> They were both eligible for marriage at the time. They undoubtedly knew of the named London haunts. Small-pox would be of more than ordinary interest to them. (Incidentally, Martha Blount was just recovering from an attack of small-pox, and a flippant reference to it would be extraordinarily indelicate were the verse letter to her or her sister.) Gay dined 'daily' with the maids-of-honour,<sup>3</sup> so that his name would have currency as a quip. He appears also in both 'A Farewell to London' and 'The Court Ballad'. The line about the good priests and the Chevalier is a piece of gossip that Pope told Teresa Blount in a letter of 1715;<sup>4</sup> there would have been little point in repeating it to her in verse.

<sup>1</sup> *Minor Poems*, pp. 180 f.

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, *Correspondence*, i. 427: 'Mrs Lepell walk'd all alone with me three or 4 hours, by moonlight' (13 September 1717).

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* i. 379.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* i. 309.

We are assuming here that, while the dashing ladies of the Court would enjoy the licentiousness of the 'suppressed' lines, the chaste Blount sisters would not. This assumption, I feel, is valid enough. It could be objected, however, that Pope at this time was not above writing a rather off-colour account of an hermaphrodite on show in London, and sending it to the Miss Blounts (and also to the perhaps even tenderer Miss Betty Marriot) in the guise of a letter from a brother.<sup>1</sup> Could not the grossness of the 'suppressed' lines have been addressed to them too? Facing such argument, one can only revert to aesthetic considerations and point out the anomaly of beginning a poem, 'As some fond virgin, whom her mother's care . . .' and ending it, still speaking of the same person, 'And if poor *Pope* is cl-pt, the Fault is yours'. The indecorousness of this—if not beyond Pope—should certainly not be credited to him without proof. The ending of the Epistle as we now have it is perfect:

Vext to be still in town, I knit my brow,  
Look sow'r, and hum a tune—as you may now.

The last phrase closes the circle that links the two people, each dreaming of the other's situation. Pope is not always careful in transitions; but anyone who wishes to read, with Ruffhead, the sixteen lines as though they 'immediately follow the last line of the printed copy' must face a disjuncture hard to match in all Pope's works: 'In this strange Town a different Course we take . . .'. The word 'different' implies that there is something to be different *from*. The idea of the last two lines of the Epistle proper, as we have just seen, is that the two people have similar feelings though their situations are opposite. It is meaningless to say that the course taken in the city is different from this unity: the comparison is faulty, impossible. For contrast with the town one must go back at least ten lines to the young lady in the country; but in those ten lines the contrast has already been made, and in a way perfectly in keeping with the mood of the poem up to that point. The 'different Course' of the 'suppressed' lines contradicts the town scene of 'streets, chairs, and coxcombs' established at the end of the Epistle as we have it. The words 'different Course' have no logical meaning in the context; and we can only relieve Pope of this illogicality by denying that the context exists, that this juncture was ever in his mind.

<sup>1</sup> *Correspondence*, i. 277-9.

## WILLIAM MOTHERWELL AND ROBERT A. SMITH

By WILLIAM MONTGOMERIE

WHEN the history of Scottish Balladry is finally written in a balanced manner, it is probable that the three names of most significance will be recognized as Sir Walter Scott, William Motherwell, and Gavin Greig. In each case their work marks a turning-point in ballad study. Scott first aroused world-wide interest in Scotland at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and much of that interest was in the Scottish ballads. Indeed, some American scholars still think of all Scottish ballads as Border Ballads.<sup>1</sup>

Scott's *Minstrelsy* had a fundamental weakness. In an effort to make ballads into literature he 'spoiled the simplicity of the old song'.<sup>2</sup> He tried to change ballads from songs into poems.

Confirmed in his practice by Scott's letter to him, Motherwell in theory and practice—more in theory than practice—marked the turning-point in ballad editing. The evidence of this is more extensive in his manuscripts than in his printed *Minstrelsy Ancient and Modern*, some of which was edited in the Scott manner before he received Scott's letter. Secondly, with the help of his friend Andrew Blaikie of Paisley, he printed thirty-three tunes at the end of his collection of ballads.

This Paisley group of ballad collectors and musicians has been rather overshadowed by the claims made for Robert Tannahill<sup>3</sup> as a song writer, and for William Motherwell as a poet. The obscurity has been deepened by the poor quality of the research and of the publications containing it.

Gavin Greig<sup>4</sup> of Aberdeenshire, whose significance I can no more than mention, is in fact, though not yet in fame, the greatest of the three in this field of balladry. He combined the accuracy of the scholar, which Scott lacked and Motherwell had, with musical knowledge, which both Scott and Motherwell lacked. He was able to transfer to writing and musical notation and, through the editing of Alexander Keith, to print much of the traditional ballad material of the north-east of Scotland. His work on folk-song apart from ballads has still to be studied.

<sup>1</sup> E.g. the two photographs opposite p. 60 of *The Ballad Tree* by Evelyn Kendrick Wells (London, 1950). They are of two 'Border Scenes', one on the Tay, the other in Midlothian.

<sup>2</sup> Letter from Scott to Motherwell, 3 May 1825.

<sup>3</sup> 1774-1810. *Poems and Songs* (Glasgow, 1807).

<sup>4</sup> 1856-1914. *Folk-Song of the North-East* (*Buchan Observer*, 1907-11), Alexander Keith (ed.), *Last Leaves of Traditional Ballads and Ballad Airs* (Aberdeen, 1925). Greig collected 2,500 texts and 2,300 records of tunes. These consist of ballads and folk-songs.

However, this is merely introductory, an attempt to give in broad outline the Scottish background to this little corner of Scotland where Motherwell<sup>1</sup> did his work. I have chosen as my starting-point the correspondence between Motherwell and his friend Robert Archibald Smith,<sup>2</sup> because it is small in bulk and can be handled in a short essay, and because of its intrinsic interest as an introduction to the Scottish West Country Ballads.

It is probable that the letters quoted here<sup>3</sup> were unknown to the few biographers of R. A. Smith. Had they been known, it is likely that they would have been heavily censored, or suppressed, by his apologists. Time, which has turned these private documents into raw material for literary and musical history, has also removed the necessity for their suppression. Their value is in the light they throw on the private attitudes of Smith, whose influence on Motherwell has not yet been accurately assessed. Typical of his time in many ways, he was an essential part of Motherwell's cultural background, and was a bad model for an editor whose accuracy as a ballad collector was admired by Professor Francis Child.

Two of Motherwell's letters to Smith are quoted for their value to the historian of the traditional ballad.

The first letter, from Motherwell to Smith, names the artist of at least one of the quaint illustrations in the first edition of Motherwell's *Minstrelsy* (facing p. 388), gives the title of a forthcoming book with a reference to Smith as musical collaborator, and describes one of the most amusing incidents of Motherwell's rather humourless life.

Paisley 2 January 1825.

... I shall be glad to hear any communications or suggestions you may have to make touching the ballad book on which I am at present employed. I forget whether I mentioned to you that our friend Andrew Henderson<sup>4</sup> is to embellish it with sundry delectable etchings the first of which I expect will be forthcoming with the next number tho', God knows, he too is abundantly lazy like the rest of us. By the bye where be all those famous old women from whom you were accustomed to collect your ancient ditties methinks if I knew where they abide I also could squeeze some precious drops of poesy from their withered bosoms?

When this publication is finished I intend printing a limited impression of another to be entitled 'The West Countrie Garland', the materials of which I

<sup>1</sup> 1797-1835. *Minstrelsy Ancient and Modern* (Glasgow, 1827).

<sup>2</sup> 1780-1829. *The Scottish Minstrel* (Edinburgh, 1821-4). For his life, see *D.N.B.* and Rev. James Thomson, 'R. A. Smith', *Daily Express*, 7 Feb. 1923.

<sup>3</sup> Glasgow University Library, MSS. Letters R. A. Smith and Motherwell. I record here my thanks to Mr. John L. Weir, Keeper of the Manuscripts, who has given me every assistance.

<sup>4</sup> 1782-1835. Portrait painter. Editor of *Scottish Proverbs* (Edinburgh, 1832) with Preface by Motherwell. Henderson, Motherwell, and John Donald Carrick were the chief contributors to *The Laird of Logan* (Glasgow, 1835-7). There is a portrait of Motherwell by Henderson in the National Portrait Gallery, Edinburgh.

have amassed while busy about the present. Only a few copies will be printed for part of the contents would not do to be extensively circulated. The tunes I also have got noted down which I wish you to see before publishing as on this head you will be able to give me some valuable information.

I have been long searching for some person who can sing the ballad of Jamie Douglas.<sup>1</sup> A copy of this ballad you will find in Finlay's collection or as you may not get Finlay's book so readily you will find it in Gilchrist's ballads. Perhaps about Edinburgh you may light on some one who recites it; hitherto in this quarter I have been unsuccessful. The reason I am so anxious to recover a recited<sup>2</sup> copy is this that I believe and have frequently been told that the song of 'Waly Waly up yon bank' is part and portion of the same ballad but how incorporated some of my informers were uncertain others told me it was the concluding part of it. This is not improbable as you will find they assimilate in subject well, and their tune is the same. In one of my rambles lately I lighted, Lord knows how, in a house I afterwards learned to be not of the most wholesome description and here I began instituting various most pertinent enquiries on the subject of ancient song. The woman of the house was old and she rhymed over much—Amongst others she gave me some stanzas of Jamie Douglas which unfortunately I could not transcribe for lack of materials but she too concurred in assuring me that she always sang and always had heard the ballad sung with Waly at the end of it. Two days after I returned loaded with implements to rescue this precious ballad from oblivion but to my mortification found my old lady squatted on the floor roaring fou'. The neighbours gathered round on hearing her vociferations when I opened the door, and you may fancy to yourself how confoundedly queer I felt to be discovered in the society of a whore thief and Drunkard. I bolted off like a shot and never have had courage to look in upon her again. So much for the history of ballad hunting. Not many would suffer this martyrdom of reputation for the sake of an old Song; for mine own part however I would not have valued the world's opinion a straw had I only proved successful but to be disappointed thus at the very eve when all my hopes were to be realized is hard enough. . . .

In the next letter Smith begins to reveal himself as one of those editors who create false evidence about their material. To quote accurately a man's own words, a century after his death, and to allow those private words to destroy his reputation for honesty, is not to be guilty of that destruction. The verdict can only be *felo de se*. Other reputations, like that of Peter Buchan,<sup>3</sup> another contemporary of Motherwell and Smith, need to be

<sup>1</sup> Motherwell found three copies very shortly afterwards, from Mrs. Trail of Paisley, from Rebecca Dunse, a native of Galloway, and from Jean Nicol (MS., pp. 297–304), and others later.

<sup>2</sup> The use of the word 'sing' above, and of the word 'tune' shortly afterwards—both referring to this *recited* ballad—defines the meaning of 'recited' as used by Motherwell.

<sup>3</sup> 1790–1854. *Gleanings of Scotch, English, and Irish, Scarce Old Ballads* (Peterhead, 1825). *Ancient Ballads and Songs of the North of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1828). See William Walker, *Peter Buchan and Other Papers* (Aberdeen, 1915).

restored, but that of Smith needs to be defined, and his own private letters are the best evidence. With the renewed interest in ballad and folk-song, it will be necessary to examine all the sources, and Smith's work in this field is tainted. But let Smith speak for himself:

Edinburgh 2<sup>d</sup> June 1825.

... I promised to send him [Purdie]<sup>1</sup> your Ballad<sup>2</sup> of 'The broom blooms bonnie' and told him a long story about the many journeys I had to Craigenfeoch to write it down from the old woman. He is most anxious to be put into possession of the treasure, and as soon as I can force myself to sit down and transcribe it, I shall get a Copy in all its glory.

Almost a year later, writing to Motherwell of a projected 'Initiatory Book for Singing', Smith completely destroys any possible trust in his work as a source for ballads and songs.

Edinburgh 8th April 1826

... I have *amused* myself by Composing several *genuine* Melodies; viz: Old *Scotish*, Old *English*, Spanish—Portuguese—Savoyard, &c. These are *mixed* up with *real* Irish, French, Greek, and Russian airs, which I *trust* will help to blind the *knowing ones*.—I intend it as a prelude to a work of greater magnitude,<sup>3</sup> Consisting of Melodies of Various Nations, the Poetry to be, if possible, *Original*, and I think, if I keep in Spirits, that I will make some notable discoveries of Melodies, not yet even in *embryo existence*. But this is a tale that 'must not be spoken'. . . .

In this same letter Smith, referring to a review of some of his work to be written by Motherwell, advises his friend in Paisley:

... Perhaps it might be a good hoax to say 'Copied from a *London Periodical*', as it will not *take* if it be thought to come from *Paisley*—Purdie, the Publisher, must *never* know any thing of the matter, saving reading the *Article itself*. . . .

Now do not, my dear Friend imagine for a moment that I wish the proposed Review to be inserted from Egotistical motives, Not but a little flattery is as welcome to me as to others, but I do assure you *honestly*, that, on the present occasion, I wish to get a good story *manufactured* more for the joke than any other thing.—A little amusement of this kind helps wonderfully to keep up the Spirits in this envious and backbiting world, and I see no harm in now & then sounding ones own trumpet, when it does not injure others.

Smith's crudeness in the above letter is remarkable. Writing from his address in the Scottish capital, the Musical Director of St. George's Church refers to his publisher, mentions London where he hopes to be noticed—even if he has to arrange it himself—denies selfish motives which

<sup>1</sup> At the Music Warehouse, 17 Princes St., Edinburgh.

<sup>2</sup> The ballad of 'Leesoe Brand', of which Motherwell collected at least two versions (MS., pp. 365 and 625).

<sup>3</sup> See letter of 22 July 1826.

he contradicts by justifying sounding one's own trumpet, and leaves in Motherwell's mind an impression of worldly success and dishonesty, at a time when Motherwell is working on his own *Minstrelsy*. It is not surprising that we find in Motherwell's book, published the following year, 'The Twa Corbies' and 'The Crusader's Farewell', inserted no doubt to blind the *knowing ones*.<sup>1</sup>

William Motherwell's claim on our attention is that he was a fundamentally honest man, despite the temptation of his friend Smith, and his recordings of traditional ballads are trustworthy. The purpose of this essay is to exclude, to a large extent, the work of R. A. Smith from the corpus of excellent balladry and folk-song collected, mainly in the 1820's, in the neighbourhood of Paisley. William Motherwell has links, through correspondence, with Scott, C. K. Sharpe, Peter Buchan, James Thomson, and others.

Because Motherwell and others collected there, we know that this district, early in the nineteenth century, and therefore for some time before that, had a wealth of tradition which seems now to be largely dead.<sup>2</sup> The ballad singers had sung their songs through the centuries with a very strict code of accuracy to which they often applied the adjective 'richt'—a favourite word of Hogg's mother.<sup>3</sup> Into this world of Scottish popular tradition Motherwell penetrated; in it Smith was an interfering busybody. On his own confession, he often hated it and its products, unless he could steal some of its carefully preserved treasures from the 'folk' to be used as raw material for his own compositions:

Edinburgh  
9th May 1826.

... I send you *just now* a Song from 'Woodstock' which my Pupils seem to be very fond of. It was Composed by my *Grandfather*—TELL IT NOT—...

One might be able to ignore Smith's interference, if he did not, in his letters, make an occasional claim to accuracy in his recording. The following extracts will show what I mean:

Edinburgh 22<sup>d</sup> July 1826

I am now seriously engaged with my little Work of *National Melodies*.<sup>4</sup>...

<sup>1</sup> Motherwell's forgeries have seldom, if ever, deceived anyone, because his poetical gift was really very small. Very few have achieved print. They bulk larger in his manuscripts.

<sup>2</sup> This is a rash statement, as another collector may uncover at any time a nest of singing birds. All I can claim is that I have tried, with local help, to find ballad-singers where Motherwell once found them, and have failed.

<sup>3</sup> One Scottish folk-singer, whom I was recording, refused for three years to allow me to record a song which she described as 'no richt'. The mistake was in one word, referring to part of a sailing ship. Her husband was a fisherman, and she was afraid other fishermen would catch her out making a technical mistake.

<sup>4</sup> *Select Melodies, with appropriate words, chiefly original, collected arranged with symphonies and Accompaniments for the Pianoforte* (Edinburgh, [1827]).

By the bye I have one capital old English Melody—(don't start,—I do assure you, this one *is genuine*.) My Mother, and my Grand Mother, used to sing it to one of Robin Hood's Ballads, and it has never gone from my memory—A few days ago I committed it to Paper and arranged it for the Piano Forte, and I am most anxious to get good words—They must be very cheerful. The air is one of those joyous strains, that would make a man bound thro' the forest with a light heart—I will give you the beginning of the Song it was sung to—

When Phoebus had melted the 'sicles of ice,  
And likewise the mountains of snow;  
Bold Robin Hood, he, would frolicsome be,  
To go abroad with his long bow

. . . . .

All this time, Motherwell was preparing his *Minstrelsy Ancient and Modern*, making some effort to have the tunes recorded. Smith's reference to Allan Cunningham in the next letter, in view of his own letter of 8 April 1826, is very strange. On the face of it, forgery was an offence only when committed by other people.

Edinburgh, June 1<sup>st</sup> 1827.

. . . Are the Tunes all ready for your Ballads? I suppose Andrew Blaikie<sup>1</sup> will be furnishing them—with him you may depend on their being *real*, but they will be blessed stuff—

. . . It is devilish good of you to give Allan Cunningham<sup>2</sup> a *hitcher*—These *forgers* really deserve to be punished a little for their heinous offences, imposing on people to such an extent, making even the wise look foolish when they discover the trick. . . .

Motherwell's cultural isolation in the little town of Paisley is reflected in Smith's letter written later in the same month. The writer had himself experienced what he describes, having been Precentor in Paisley Abbey from 1807 to 1823, which followed the years he had spent in the town before that in less prominent circumstances. Smith is much more explicit in this letter, and it amplifies the impression that his letter of 8 April 1826 must have made on Motherwell.

Edinburgh 11<sup>th</sup> June 1827

. . . I am sorry to observe you are not happily situated in that beautiful town of yours—I wonder not at your uneasiness—Had I remained there, I should have been long ere now in the Grave—Would to heaven both yourself & Kennedy had good situations here—You would find society you could commune with.

<sup>1</sup> Engraver and musician of Paisley. Later, session-clerk and precentor to Paisley Abbey. He was the owner of two seventeenth-century music manuscripts of considerable value.

<sup>2</sup> Allan Cunningham (1784–1842) published *The Songs of Scotland, Ancient and Modern* (London, 1825). Smith's reference is probably to a review of the books by Motherwell. Cunningham forged most of Cromek's *Remains of Nithsdale and Galloway Song* (London, 1810).

If we allow Smith's own letters to destroy his reputation for accuracy, their evidence may be used to confirm the accuracy of Andrew Blaikie. The next letter seems to trace some at least of the tunes in Motherwell's *Minstrelsy to the Borders*.

Edinburgh 8th Dec: 1827

. . . I really was afraid that *your* Old Ballads would have preceded *my* old Melodies, . . . I do certainly expect some most delectable Border dumps, noted by worthy Andrew during some of his peregrinations to the debateable land of Thieves & Murderers, from the Melifluous Crooning of Taylor Hogg and other Border Sempsters or Sempstresses.—However, the Amateurs of these *precious remains* may rest perfectly assured that they are all *genuine*; THAT will make most ample amends for their ugliness. . . .

Probably the publication of Motherwell's *Minstrelsy* in 1827 brought Peter Buchan to Paisley. His *Ancient Ballads and Songs of the North of Scotland* was published in Edinburgh later in 1828. Smith being Motherwell's Edinburgh correspondent, Motherwell naturally passed Buchan on to him.

Paisley 29 May 1828

My dear Smith

This will be handed to you by my friend Mr Peter Buchan the Annalist of Peterhead and one who has done more than any one I know to collect the ancient traditional ballads of Scotland. Mr Buchan is curious to be acquainted with you. Your fame he has heard of in the North—and you I daresay will feel as much pleasure in forming acquaintance with one whom I recommend to your attention.

Mr Buchan is at present in Edinburgh regarding the publication of a Volume of ancient ballads which I can assure you will form a most important and interesting addition to our literature of that description. If you can in any shape assist Mr Buchan's views you oblige me—and having seen his collection & knowing something of the subject I can assure you that any way in which it can be spoken of must redound much to the credit of the patriotism & industry of the indefatigable collector.

I am

My Dear Smith

Yours ever faithfully

W. Motherwell.

R. A. Smith Esq  
11 Melville place

Edinburgh  
12th June  
1828

. . . I had a visit from Peter Buchan, and had a long *crack* with him.—I did all I could to prevail with him to publish his work with his *own* notes, *unaltered*—Mr D. Laing,<sup>1</sup> I understand, wishes to *Polish* and *Condense*. This Polishing, in

<sup>1</sup> David Laing (1793–1878), bookseller and antiquary. He became Librarian of the Signet Library, Edinburgh, in 1837. His works are so extensive that they cannot be listed in a footnote.

my poor opinion, would quite destroy their originality, and render them as common place as ten thousand other publications of the kind—Honest Peter is evidently of the *same mind* himself, but he appears to be afraid of disobliging Mr Laing.— . . .

Smith's last letter to Motherwell was sent about two months before Smith died.

Edin: 27<sup>th</sup> Oct 1828.

I send you a Ballad that I bought in the streets of York, I forgot to give it you when you were here—I think one or two of the Songs will prove an addition to your Collection of rarities—Peter Buchan's are nothing to them—

Reading these few fragments is a more stimulating introduction to the Scottish West Country Ballads than a study of anything written about Motherwell or Smith by their biographers. Though Motherwell never met Sir Walter Scott, he corresponded with him, and worked under his influence. Peter Buchan from Peterhead, one of the least rewarded of ballad collectors, wanders into and out of the lives of Motherwell and Smith carrying his huge ballad manuscript. Andrew Henderson the artist, Andrew Blaikie, and the women who sang 'Jamie Douglas' and 'Leesome Brand' to Motherwell, are brought together in the shadow of Paisley Abbey, whose antiquity fascinated Motherwell, and where both Smith and Blaikie were, at different times, precentors.

We are coming more and more to the defence of the women who sang ballads to Motherwell. They were the end of a long line of singers who preserved ballads in the Scottish West Country. Surely the end of all that loving labour was to be recorded accurately, and the words and tunes preserved as sung. Among the people mentioned in this correspondence, Motherwell and Blaikie pass the test for accuracy. Smith, on the evidence of his own letters, is more than suspect.

## NOTES

### ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS IN COTTON MS. JULIUS E VII<sup>1</sup>

IN the copy of Ælfric's homily on the Life of St. Edmund in Cotton MS. Julius E VII, a number of alterations have been made to a sentence near the end of the homily which refers to the burial-place of the saint (ll. 255 ff. in Skeat's edition). The manuscript reads (f. 204<sup>v</sup>, ll. 21 ff.):

is  
wyrðe                      seo stow for þam wurðfullan hal  
gan þ̅ hi man wurpige 7 wel gelogige mid clæ  
num godes þeowum.

The italicized letters stand on erasures in a contemporary hand; the insertion in the preceding line, marked by a single point below the line, is in the same hand; between *wyrðe* and *seo stow* four or five letters have been erased. From the readings presented by the other three manuscripts of the homily, it seems reasonable to assume that what Julius originally read, and what Ælfric wrote, was: *wyrðe wære seo stow . . . þ̅ hi man wurpode 7 wel gelogode . . .* At the time when Ælfric was writing, the shrine of St. Edmund was in the keeping of a small community of secular canons: its guardians were not regular monks until 1020, when the clerks were dispossessed and Benedictines from the monasteries of St. Benet's of Holme and Ely installed in their place. A charter of endowment and liberties was granted them by Cnut in 1028, and on Cnut's orders a new stone church was built to replace the old one of wood; work began on the new building in 1020, and it was completed and consecrated in 1032. The changes in the passage in Ælfric's homily in MS. Julius clearly represent an attempt to bring it up to date some time after these events. It seems possible, furthermore, that they may have been made in Bury itself; for the manuscript came from the Abbey library, and was there at least as early as the thirteenth century.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ed. W. W. Skeat: *Ælfric's Lives of Saints* (E.E.T.S., O.S. 76, 82, 94, 114, 1881-1900). Skeat's edition does not include the last two items in the manuscript, Ælfric's translation of Alcuin's *Interrogationes Sigewulfi*, and his homily *De Falsis Diis*. A large number of the corrections discussed here are mentioned in the footnotes in Skeat's edition, but not all. Skeat appears not to have recorded corrections he regarded as good, unless they were of special interest. He usually prints the corrected form in the text, sometimes, but not often, in square brackets. See also his notes, Vol. I, p. 488, at the beginning of XXIII, and p. 544, on ll. 214.

<sup>2</sup> On f. 1<sup>r</sup> a thirteenth-century hand has written *Liber s̅c̅i Aedmundi regis et m̅r̅s̅*. The manuscript is probably to be identified with Item 169: *Magnus Liber sermonum in anglica*

Additions and alterations in the same hand occur in fifteen of the thirty-nine pieces in the manuscript, viz. II, XI, XII, XIII, XVI, XVIII, XIX, XX, XXI, XXII, XXIII, XXV, XXVI, XXX, XXXII. The additions are usually written between the lines, the place where the interpolation is to be made being in most cases marked by a double point, like a colon, below the line. The interlineations themselves, especially the longer ones, are often preceded by a second double point. Some of the shorter insertions are marked, like that at XXXII. 255 above, by only a single point below the line.<sup>1</sup> A few of the interlined additions in this hand have no mark of insertion at all.

Typical of the additions in this hand are:<sup>2</sup> *forðan þe þa modigan ne magon* [cuman næfre] *to heofonum* XVI. 129; *He ferde swa swa his forcuða fæder 7 swa swa his fracode modor him yfele gebysnodon* XVIII. 229-30; *7 axode hine sona. hwylcere eawfæstnysse he wære. swylce he cwæde* [hwæder eart ðu] *cristen oððe hæðen* XXII. 204-5; *7 hit eft sæde swa swa we* [hit] *secgað her* XXXII. 129. The phrase *þ is on englisc* is introduced on nine occasions before the translation of a Latin quotation; at XVI. 33 the formula is varied slightly: *Ðæt is ongliscre spræce* (presumably for *o[n e]ngliscre spræce*). Other favourite insertions are: *god* after *ælmihstig* used as a noun, as at XIX. 184, *clypað to ðam ælmihstigan gode 7 his arfæstnysse bit* (II occurrences); a possessive pronoun is introduced on nine occasions, e.g.: *sumes þegnes cniht feoll færlíce of* [his] *horse* XXI. 323; on two occasions (XI. 297 and XXV. 281) the line division has made it possible to add the pronoun in the margin at the end of the line. Similarly at XXV. 674, *7 bebyrigdon on modin*, the words *ðære byrig* have been added after *on* in the margin at the end of the line, while at XXII. 36, *he com ða to rauenna* [ðære byrig], they have been added in the more usual fashion.

*lingua*, in a s.xii/xiii catalogue of the Bury library, printed by M. R. James, *On the Abbey Church of S. Edmund at Bury* (Cambridge, 1895), pp. 23-32; cf. N. R. Ker, *Mediaeval Libraries of Great Britain* (London, 1941), p. 13. A list of books in the possession of the monastery or its members in 1044, when Leofstan succeeded to the abbacy, is preserved in MS. C.C.C., Oxford, 197 (printed by A. J. Robertson, *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (Cambridge, 1939), p. 196, no. civ). None of the books enumerated in the list can 'be identified with volumes which we possess, though it is likely enough that some of the thirty volumes at his [Leofstan's] country house "exclusive of church-books" may be still extant' (James, p. 6). Perhaps Julius E VII is one such.

<sup>1</sup> Point insertions do not occur outside the fifteen homilies revised by this corrector, and most of them are certainly in his hand. It is impossible to be sure of every instance, but it seems likely that he is responsible for all of them. Various other hands, contemporary or only slightly later, have made insertions in the manuscript; in particular, there is a large number of insertions marked by a caret. Almost all the corrections marked in this way repair short, straightforward omissions, often of only single letters, and have all the appearance of being the result of collation with an exemplar. They occur evenly distributed throughout the whole manuscript. Many of them are by the same hand as the body of the text; a few of them could be by the point-corrector.

<sup>2</sup> Additions written above the line in the manuscript are printed here within the line between half square brackets. The points above and below the line by which the insertions are marked have not been reproduced.

Favourite spelling corrections are<sup>1</sup> *ecan* (oblique case forms of the adjective) to *ec<sub>1</sub>e<sub>1</sub>an* (13 times; *e* is inserted after palatal *c* in the infinitives *pinc<sub>1</sub>e<sub>1</sub>an*, *bepenc<sub>1</sub>e<sub>1</sub>an*, and *bepæc<sub>1</sub>e<sub>1</sub>an* at XXIII. 93, 188, 602); the adverb (miswritten) *pone* corrected to *pon<sub>1</sub>n<sub>1</sub>e* (5 times; at XI. 171 the pronoun *pone* is 'corrected' in the same way); the proper name *Cedwalla* altered to *Ce<sub>1</sub>a<sub>1</sub>d<sub>1</sub>walla* at XXVI. 9, 11, 152 (but not at 28, the only other occurrence in the homily). Occasionally the addition repairs a genuine omission: at XXV. 622, for example, 7 *iudas him com<sub>1</sub> to mid prim ðusend cempum*; and again at XXVI. 243, *se in<sub>1</sub> gymde his lare*, and XXI. 399, *to win<sub>1</sub>ceastre*. At XXV. 711, *þ þridde gefeohte is<sub>1</sub> þe of geflite cymð. betwux ceastergewarum is swyðe pleolic*, the insertion of *is* is undoubtedly wrong, but is supported by all three of the other manuscripts.

Altogether I have noted nearly 300 of these additions. Alterations in the same hand made over an erasure are less frequent, but are occasionally quite extensive, and provide the best examples of the corrector's hand. At XXV. 628 the phrase *an hund þusend manna* stands on erasure, the other three manuscripts suggesting that the original reading was *hund teontig þusenda*. At XII. 131-2, where the other three manuscripts agree in reading *forðan þe se trywleasa ne bið nanum hlaforde to hæbbenne ne eac se soðfæsta god his ne recð*, in place of *se soðfæsta god his* stands *ðæs untrewan god*, in the corrector's hand on erasure. Occasionally the erasure has not made sufficient room for the insertion, which is then continued above the line, marked, like other interlineations in the corrector's hand, by point insertion-marks. Thus at XXV. 65-66, after *on þam twam gecyðnyssum*, the corrector has inserted, partly on erasure and in the margin, partly above the line, *þ is on þære ealdan .æ. 7 on ðære niwan gecyðnysse<sub>1</sub>*, where MS. C.C.C.C. 303 has simply *þa ealdan. 7 þa niwan*.<sup>2</sup> Again at XII. 293-4, after *Sy him a wuldor*, the corrector has inserted, partly on erasure and partly above the line, *ðe leofað. 7 rixað on ecnys<sub>1</sub>se ece drihten Am<sub>1</sub>;<sub>1</sub>*; the other three manuscripts read *Si him a wuldor on ecnysse. Amen*.<sup>3</sup> At XXV. 746, *we habbað forlætan . . . an wundorlic ðincg. þe we willaþ secgan nu, secgan* is in the corrector's hand on erasure, two of the other three manuscripts

<sup>1</sup> The inserted letter is in all cases written above the line, with a single or double point below the line.

<sup>2</sup> Most of the passage is omitted from MS. C.C.C.C. 198, the only other manuscript of this part of the homily.

<sup>3</sup> XII. 293-4 originally followed l. 288, and were followed by the note, 289-92, with which the homily ended: Skeat has followed the corrector's transposition marks which bring the note forward to precede the doxology. The doxology—or lack of it—attracted the corrector's attentions in six of the fifteen homilies he revised. He added doxologies at the end of homilies XXIII (ll. 838-40) and XVI (ll. 382-4), and expanded those at the end of XXVI and XXXII. Ll. 496-8 of XXI follow l. 463 in the manuscript and conclude the homily on St. Swithun: the corrector has marked them to be transposed to the end of the appendix to the homily (ll. 464-95), a strange story about St. Macarius and the girl whose parents had been deluded by sorcerers into thinking she was a mare.

having *writan*, the third *awritan*. Earlier in the same homily, at l. 205, in a similar context, the corrector has written *asecgan* above *awritan*. He has supplied an alternative word in a similar fashion elsewhere, e.g. at XVIII. 350, *hetse* glossed *ſceande*. On two occasions a word has been crossed out and a substitute provided by means of a point insertion: at XVIII. 121, *7 hi sylfe gewundodon*, *wundodon* is crossed out and replaced in this way by *drehton*; and at XXII. 247, on *pære ec[e]an* [*eadignysse*], *eadignysse* has been substituted in the same way for *wuldre* (*ære* of *pære* is on erasure, also in the corrector's hand).<sup>1</sup>

Finally the corrector's activities include a large number of alterations consisting of the cancellation of a letter by *punctum delens*, and its replacement by another written above it. The most curious of them is the sporadic alteration of dative plural *him* to *heom*. There are forty-nine instances: on two occasions, it is worth noticing, the *i* of *him* is cancelled by a double point like the colon insertion-mark. At XXIII. 224 and 281 *hi* standing at the end of the line has been altered to *hēo*. More commonly the *punctum delens* is used in the correction of vowels in inflexional syllables. There are about seventy instances of a late inflexional *-e* corrected to earlier *-a* in this way; there are, in addition, seven instances of inflexional *-a* written over erasure, presumably of *-e*. The correction is commonest in the genitive plural (22 ×), especially the genitive plural of the definite article (8 ×); the nominative and accusative plural of strong feminine nouns (16 ×), especially nouns in *-nyss* (5 ×) and *-ung* (3 ×); the nominative singular of weak masculine nouns and adjectives (11 ×); and the infinitive (8 ×). Occasionally (4 ×) the inverted spelling *-a* for *-e* is corrected in the same way; more often (27 ×) the front of the *-a* is erased and the remaining back stroke converted to *-e* by the addition of a bow. In thirty-eight instances *-e* stands entirely on erasure, presumably of *-a*. The correction is commonest in the dative singular of strong nouns (19 ×), especially nouns in *-ung* (8 ×);<sup>2</sup> nominative and accusative plural of strong adjectives (8 ×); nominative singular of weak feminine nouns and adjectives (8 ×); *eal(l)ra* (genitive and dative singular feminine) is corrected to *eal(l)re* (8 ×).<sup>3</sup> There are a number of corrections in which *u*, written *v*, is substituted for final *-e* or *-a*, in, for example, the nominative singular of

<sup>1</sup> The corrector is also responsible for the inserted *e* in *ec[e]an*.

<sup>2</sup> At xxv. 597, *mid leasungū*, where *-ū* stands on erasure, presumably of *-a* (vll. *-a*, *-e*), the dative plural ending has been substituted instead of the 'correct' dative singular. Similarly at xxvi. 39, *purh oswaldes geeaungū*, the *-ū* is on erasure (vl. *-a*); but here the presumed original reading was accusative singular or plural. In homilies xxiv–xxix the accusative is used invariably after *purh*. See also K. Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp. 184–5 and p. 185, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> At xxiii. 388, *be ðæra*, *martyra*, *ariste*, the corrector has taken *ðæra*, for *ðære*, dative singular feminine, at its face value as genitive plural, and inserted *martyra*—possible grammar, but poor sense.

short feminine *ā*- stems, and nominative and accusative plural of short neuter *ō*-stems. Finally there are three examples of *-e*- in the preterite plural inflexion *-en*, corrected to *-o*-.

GEOFFREY NEEDHAM

## TRANSLATIONS OF THE CLASSICS INTO ENGLISH BEFORE 1600

IN his review of Dr. Percy Simpson's study entitled 'Shakespeare's Use of Latin Authors' Professor J. A. K. Thomson cites (*R.E.S.*, N.S. vii (1956), 426) and uses as part of his argument an assertion by Dr. R. R. Bolgar (*The Classical Heritage* (Cambridge, 1954), p. 532) that an English translation of the *Amphitryo* by W. Courtney was published in 1562/3. There was, however, no such work. What caused the mistake was no doubt the entry in 1562/3 to W. Copland of the anonymous farce called *Jacke Jugeler*, which was partly based on two scenes of Plautus's play (but which cannot possibly have furnished Shakespeare with the *Amphitryo* elements in his *Comedy of Errors* referred to by Professor Thomson).<sup>1</sup>

Appendix II of Dr. Bolgar's absorbing and on the whole very valuable pioneer work is a comparative table of translations from the Classics into English, French,<sup>2</sup> German, Italian, and Spanish made before 1600, from which the above item is taken. I have attempted an evaluation of the English section only, but the German, French, and Italian lists would seem to be on about the same level; on the Spanish material I am not qualified to speak. Such almost unannotated lists cannot be expected to give detailed information on each individual item, but Dr. Bolgar might have warned his readers that this is so (e.g. the majority of translations of Greek works were made at second or third hand) and that the dates given are often conjectural or those of entry into the Stationers' Register. Dr. Bolgar's main sources are the well-known works by Henrietta R. Palmer and H. B. Lathrop,<sup>3</sup> but

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Eric Jacobsen of Copenhagen University, who independently reached the same conclusion, has a letter on this point in *T.L.S.*, 4 January 1957. Mr. J. C. Maxwell (*ibid.*, 17 May 1957) calls attention to the first edition of Professor G. Highet's *The Classical Tradition* (1949, p. 121) as Dr. Bolgar's direct source; the mistake has been corrected in the reprint (1951) used by Mr. Jacobsen and me. The Courtney error is one among several taken over from Dr. Bolgar by Professor M. Grant in his *Roman Readings* (1958).

<sup>2</sup> For some corrections of the French material see Professor J. Hutton's important review in *Gnomon*, xxviii (1956), 63-66.

<sup>3</sup> *List of English Editions and Translations of Greek and Latin Classics printed before 1641* (Bibliogr. Soc., 1911), a work to be used with caution; *Translations from the Classics into English from Caxton to Chapman* (Madison, Wis., 1933), a standard work. Many of Dr. Bolgar's mistakes cannot be traced to these two books.

such obvious supplementary aids as *S.T.C.*, *C.B.E.L.*, and, so far as it goes, Mr. H. S. Bennett's list in his *English Books and Readers 1475 to 1557* of translations printed before 1560 were apparently not consulted.

My notes are merely a representative selection of such corrections and additions as seem to be called for, together with a few examples of the supplementary information without which such lists may be actually misleading. I have found it impracticable to include minor poems and extracts from prose works to be found in such collections as Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* and the poetical miscellanies, especially Tottel. Non-English translations are taken account of only incidentally. References have been reduced to a minimum.

### Greek Authors

ACHILLES TATIUS . . . by T. Burton] *W. Burton.*

ANACREON, *Carmina* (31 by R. Greene (in Alcida)] In this case, and only in this, the figure in parentheses does not indicate the number of items translated. *Alcida* includes only one poem based on the Anacreontea, viz. on no. 31 in the *Poetae Lyrici* as pub. by Bergk (no. 33 in the Loeb edn.).

ANTHOLOGIA GRAECA, *Epigrammata* (61) T. Kendall . . . 1577] Several of the epigrams are actually versions by Turberville, more or less as they appear in his *Epitaphes, Epigrams, Songs and Sonets* (1567), which is never mentioned; nor are such versions as those in Tottel and the (doubtful) one by Crowley (E.E.T.S., E.S. 15 (1872), pp. 30-31). Dr. Bolgar does not mention a single rendering into other vernaculars and has no references to the important work on the *Anthology* in Italy and France done by Professor Hutton.

APPIANUS, *Historia Romana* part I, anon., 1578; part II by W. B., 1587] Both parts were translated by W. B. (possibly W. Barker; see E. Schanzer, *Shakespeare's Appian* (Liverpool, 1956)) and were issued conjointly in 1578. There was no edn. of part II in 1587.

ARISTOTELES, *Meteorologica* (extracts) by R. Wyer, 1535] There was no translation of the *Meteorologica*. About 1535 R. Wyer published an undated and anonymous translation of a pseudo-Aristotelian work *De Astronomia*. Wyer's publication was an abbreviated reprint of a work issued by R. Fakes c. 1530 (see F. R. Johnson, *Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England* (Baltimore, 1937), index) but not mentioned by Dr. Bolgar.

*Ethica* by J. Wylkinson] Translated from an Italian version of Brunetto Latini's French translation (as part of his *Li Livres dou Trésor*) of the Latin *Compendium Alexandrinum*, a rendering by Hermannus Alemannus of an Arabic summary of the Nicomachean Ethics. Dr. Bolgar thinks that Latini's translation was into Italian, and, moreover, credits him with an Italian rendering of the *Rhetorica* which never existed. The *Rettorica* of Latini is an Italian version of chs. i-xvii of Cicero's *De Inventione* and appears as such in Dr. Bolgar's list. The

Italian translator of Latini's French was Bono Giamboni, whose version of Vegetius' *De Re Militari* is not mentioned either.<sup>1</sup>

*Problemata*] Pseudo-Aristotelian (see Lathrop, pp. 267-8, and L. B. Wright, *Middle-Class Culture in Elizabethan England* (Chapel Hill, 1935), p. 581).

*Politica*] From the French of Le Roy mentioned in the French column (where *Politica* must be substituted for *Ethica*).

*Organon* by T. Blundeville] Not a translation, even if *The Art of Logike* was composed 'aswell according to the doctrine of Aristotle, as of all other moderne and best accounted Authors thereof'.<sup>2</sup>

ARRIANUS, *Epicteti Dissertationes* by J. Sandford, 1567—(French): anon., a. 1567 (the original of Sandford's translation)] There was no translation of the *Dissertationes* earlier than that of Elizabeth Carter, 1758 (or into French earlier than 1609, by Jean Goulu). The work rendered by Sandford was the *Enchiridion*, non-English versions of which are placed under Epictetus. Sandford based his text on the French of Du Moulin (1544) mentioned on p. 512, where we do find a reference to a translation of 1567; not anonymous, however, but correctly ascribed to Rivaudeau (slightly misspelt).

DEMOSTHENES, *Olynthiacae* by T. Wilson] This volume includes Wilson's translation of the *Philippicae*, not mentioned by Bolgar.

DIODORUS SICULUS, *Historia* by T. Stocker] A translation (with omissions) of books XVIII-XX only, with the Life of Demetrius from Plutarch (as in the French source, Cl. de Seyssel). Dr. Bolgar omits Skelton's translation from Poggio's Latin of books I-V, first published (minus book V and part of book IV, which are lost) in 1956 (ed. F. M. Salter and H. L. R. Edwards, E.E.T.S. 233), and the partial translations of the Prologue by Caxton and Lord Berners (see S. K. Workman's paper in *M.L.N.*, lvi (1941), 252-8).

DIODEGENES LAERTIUS, *Vitae Philosophorum* by G. H. Burley (?), a. 1490 from the medieval version as corrected by Walter Burley—(German): anon., 1490 (from the English)] Walter ('Gualtherus') Burley did not translate (or correct) Diogenes, but among the sources for his Latin *Liber de vita et moribus philosophorum et poetarum* (mentioned on p. 260 in Bolgar's book) was, of course, a Latin version

<sup>1</sup> In his paper on 'L'Aristotélisme populaire comme fragment de la Renaissance', *Rev. d'Hist. de la Philos.*, n.s. iii (1935), 33-66, Mr. Wiktor Wasik makes much of E. Pargiter's version of the *Ethica*, said to date from 1475. This is omitted by Dr. Bolgar, and rightly so, as the date is an error for 1745. Another ghost left undisturbed by Dr. Bolgar is Maurice Roll's translation of Aristotle's *Logike* mentioned in C. H. Conley's *The First English Translators of the Classics* (1927). This is a rendering of Ramus's *Dialectic* 'per M. Roll. Makylmenaeum', i.e. Roland MacIlmaine, M.A.

<sup>2</sup> The French list is disappointing. Oresme's *Yconomiques* was printed 1489, not 1484; his *Livre du ciel et du monde* was not printed 1488 but, for the first time, in 1941-3 (in *Med. St.*, iii-v); among versions omitted are Mahieu le Vilain's *Méthéores* (1260-70, printed 1945); L. de Premierfait's *Économiques* (early fifteenth century, based on Oresme); the translations of the *Ethica* by Oresme (1370, printed 1488) and Le Plessis (1553) and of the *Problemata* by Évrart de Conti (c. 1372-80). The (lost) translation of the *Politique* by Pierre de Paris (c. 1300) might also have been mentioned. One French and one Italian version of the spurious *Secreta* are no adequate indication of the great number of renderings in the vernaculars, including English.

of the *Vitae*. Even Burley's work was never translated into English. His Christian name has sometimes been given as Humphrey. The German translation is a rendering of Burley's work; it was not anonymous, nor was it made from the non-existent English, but, as stated in the colophon, 'durch Anthoni sorgen . . . auss dem latein in teütsch geschriben und gemachet . . .'. Dr. Bolgar has further perverted a misleading statement in L. S. Thompson's paper on German translations (*J.E.G.P.*, 1943, not 1947 as Bolgar has it).

EUCLID, *Elementa* by R. Candish, 1556] The date seems to be a misinterpretation of Miss Palmer's 'fl. 1556'. The only authority for the existence of this translation appears to be the rather doubtful one of John Bale in his *Catalogus*, ii (1559), III.

EURIPIDES, *Phoenissae* . . . 1566] This translation of Dolce's adaptation of a Latin version of the play was not printed till 1573, even if acted in 1566. Among French translations are mentioned three manuscript versions,<sup>1</sup> but Dr. Bolgar omits two unpublished English ones, viz. the *Iphigeneia* (at Aulis) of Lady Lumley (c. 1555), and the lost translation by Peele (c. 1575) of one of the Iphigenia plays.

HELIODORUS . . . by T. Underdowne, 1587] Entered 1568/9. The first edn. is undated but probably appeared in 1569.

HERODIANUS, *Historia* . . . 1550] The first edn. must be dated between 1554 and 1558, as shown by Lathrop.

HOMERUS, *Ilias* I-IX by A. Hall] This is the 'Ten Books of Homers Iliades'.

I-VII . . . by G. Chapman, 1598] I-II and VII-XI.

*Batrachomyomachia* by C. Johnson, 1580] Johnson's translation is into Latin verse. Dr. Bolgar rightly omits the English paraphrase by W. Fowlde (1603) which must have been mentioned if the *S.T.C.* had been correct in stating that the latter was entered in 1580. However, the entry in question was just that of Johnson's 'battell of frogges and myce in Latin verse'.

ISOCRATES, *Ad Demonicum* . . . by J. Nuttall] Richard Nuttall according to what looks like a transcript of the title-page in Ames's *Typographical Antiquities* (1749). No entry is recorded in Arber, and I have seen no first-hand reference to the book later than Ames.

LUCIANUS, *Galatea et Polyphemus* by G. Fletcher] Actually a free version of the Latin paraphrase by Johannes Secundus (see D. Crane's *Johannes Secundus* (Leipzig, 1931), p. 54. Crane finds no evidence that Fletcher consulted the Greek text).

MOSCHUS, *Idyllae* (one) by B. Barnes, 1593 (from the French)] Dr. Bolgar does not include the first English translation of this Idyl (the 'Amor fugitivus'), viz. that by Turberville in his 1567 volume, made through the Latin version of Politian. That Barnes's translation was almost certainly made directly from the Greek has been shown by Professor Hutton in his 'The First Idyl of Moschus in Imitations to the Year 1800', *A.J.P.*, xlix (1928), 105-36, a paper giving a wealth

<sup>1</sup> One of these, Baif's *Medea*, is lost. On the other hand, Dr. Bolgar omits the manuscript translation of the *Suppliantes* (see R. Lebègue in *B.H.R.*, v (1944), 381).

of vernacular renderings omitted by Dr. Bolgar. See also J. G. Fucilla, *Studies and Notes* (Napoli, 1953), pp. 99-126.

MUSAEUS, *Hero et Leander* (part) by C. Marlowe, 1593] Marlowe's poem, which is, of course, no translation, was entered in 1593, but no edn. before 1598 is known. Musaeus' poem was, however, 'Englished by me a dozen years ago, and in print' according to Abraham Fleming in 1589 (not mentioned by Dr. Bolgar).

ONOSANDER, *Strategicus* . . . 1533] 1563.

PLATO, (*Axiochus*) by J. de Mornay, 1592] A figment. The translation professes to be the work of 'Edw. Spenser' and cannot without difficulty be attributed to the poet (*pace* the editor of the *Variorum Prose Works*, 1949). But in 1607 was published an English translation of Philippe de Mornay's *Six excellent treatises of life and death*, containing *inter alia* a version (from the French) of this dialogue. Or Dr. Bolgar may be thinking of de Mornay's *Discourse of Life and Death* issued in 1592 in the translation of the Countess of Pembroke.

PLUTARCH, *de Sanitate Tuenda* by J. Wyer, 1530] The translation is undated and anonymous; it was issued by Robert Wyer. There must have been an earlier, lost edn. of which this one is an abridgement (see Lathrop's 'Some Rogueries of Robert Wyer', *Library*, 3rd series, v (1914), 349 ff.).

*ad Gallionem* by R. Whyntinton, 1547] There is no such work by Plutarch. No doubt Dr. Bolgar is thinking of Seneca's *De Remediis Fortuitorum* (written *ad Gallionem*), duly entered under Seneca. There is no mention of Sandford's translation of extracts from the *Moralia* in *The Amorous and Tragical Tales*, 1567 (containing also the extract from Heliodorus recorded by Dr. Bolgar).<sup>1</sup>

POLYBIUS, *Historia* book 1 by T. Watson] *Christopher* Watson.

PTOLEMAEUS, *Mathematicae Constructio* anon., 1550 (from the French)] Apparently a confusion with *The compost of Ptholomeus Prynce of Astronomie*, issued as an anonymous translation by R. Wyer in three edns. c. 1532-40. This is not a rendering from Ptolemaeus but a pirated extract from *The Kalendar of Shepherdes* as it appears in Notary's edn. (c. 1518), which is based mainly on Copland's version (1508) of *Le Compost et Kalendarier des bergiers*. See Lathrop's paper on Wyer.

SOPHOCLES, *Antigone* by T. Watson, 1581] Watson's translation was into *Latin* verse.

XENOPHON, *Cyropedia* I-IV by W. Barker, 1560 (?)] Actually six books. Dr. Bolgar makes no mention of the 1567 edn. containing 'the VIII bookes'.

#### *Latin Authors*

BOETHIUS . . . by J. Walton, c. 1390] All the ten dated manuscripts give 1410 as the year of composition. Dr. Bolgar omits the somewhat altered version printed

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Bolgar makes no mention of the five *Lives* translated from various Latin versions by Henry Parker, Lord Morley, nor of Morley's other manuscript translations, from Seneca and Cicero. See H. G. Wright's Introduction to Morley's *Boccaccio* (E.E.T.S. 214, 1943), pp. liv-lxii.

in 1525. Queen Elizabeth's 'Englishings' from Boethius and others may have been left out as mere curiosities (E.E.T.S., o.s. 113 (1899), containing also Sir Thomas Chaloner's translation of some of the metra, not recorded by Dr. Bolgar).

The non-English material is rather unsatisfactory. Of more than a dozen French versions only four are mentioned, three of them more or less incorrectly. That 'by J. de Meung, c. 1300 (printed 15th cent.)', is not the rendering accepted as his by modern scholarship, printed for the first time in 1952 (ed. V. L. Dedek-Héry, *Med. St.*, xiv. 165-275); that formerly attributed to Charles d'Orléans is now known to be the work of an anonymous Benedictine writing in the late fourteenth century; there was no translation 'by R. de St Trudon, 1477', but the Latin commentary prepared by him in 1381 was incorporated in the text of which an anonymous translation was printed by Mansion in 1477. Among German versions we miss that (now lost?) by Peter von Kastel (1401), unless Dr. Bolgar accepts the view that it is identical with the anonymous translation printed in 1473 and included by him; and an anonymous metrical translation of the second half of the fifteenth century. Of Notker's translations the *Boethius* is the only one mentioned. Even the Italian list is selective; Varchi's translation was printed in 1551, not 1520.

CICERO, *Pro Marcello* . . . 1535] 1555, in *A Treatise of the Figures* . . .

*Somnium Scipionis* . . . by T. Orwin, 1597] Non-existent. Dr. Bolgar may have in mind the assignment in 1591 to T. Orwin, the stationer, of T. Marshe's rights in 'Sipirons Dreames in English', i.e. Newton's translation. Or he may be thinking of the Latin edn. of the present work, among others, issued by Orwin's widow in 1595.

*Pro Archia* by T. Drant, 1571] The only thing known for certain about this is, I believe, that Warton had never seen it. He had his information about its existence from Coxeter's papers (now unfortunately lost), an unreliable source.

*Epistolae* (Cordier's selection) by A. Fleming, 1576] Here there is some confusion. In 1575 appeared an edition of Cordier's selection with English versions by one 'T. W.'. In the following year was issued Fleming's *Panoplie of Epistles* giving another selection of letters; scant justice is done to the other contents of Fleming's book. There is no mention of the *Ad Quintum* translation by G. Gylby (1561) or of the epistle joined to the translation of Ramus's Latin grammar (pub. T. Thomas, 1585).<sup>1</sup>

CLAUDIANUS] Dr. Bolgar includes a manuscript version by Lope de Vega but finds no room for the interesting English rendering (1445) of part of the *De Consulatu Stilichonis* (see E. Flügel's edn. in *Anglia*, xxviii (1905), 255-99; notes *ibid.*, 421-38).

HORATIUS] The translation by L. Evans of two satires is duly recorded (only one appears ever to have been seen, even if two were entered), but not the versions in Tottel of two odes, one of them in three different translations.

<sup>1</sup> Apart from his Italian version of the *De Inventione* Brunetto Latini made a somewhat fuller translation into French (included in the *Trésor*); this is omitted by Dr. Bolgar, as is the French version of the same work and the *Ad Herennium* by Jean d'Antioche (1282).

JUSTINUS, *Historia* by A. Golding, 1574] Actually 1564. G. Wilkins's translation (1606) should have been mentioned here if this was the 'English translation ent. to T. Orwin 23 jn. 1591', as the *S.T.C.* seems to assume. The entry in question is, however, merely a transfer to Orwin of the rights in 'Justine in English' belonging to the late T. Marshe, i.e. in Golding's translation. Dr. Bolgar has also avoided the *S.T.C.*'s mistake of giving the extracts translated by T. Norton to a mythical 'Arsanes', actually the speaker of the two orations translated.

LIVIVS] No mention of J. Bellenden's manuscript version (c. 1533) of the first five books.

MARTIALIS, Select epigrams in T. Kendall's *Flowers of Epigrams*, 1577] There is no mention of the translation by Surrey of x. 47, printed as early as 1547/8 in Baldwin's *Treatise of Morall Phylosophie*; this is the version given by Kendall. Another translation of the same poem appears in the broadside *Martial to Himselfe . . . in Latin, English, and Walsch*, 1571, omitted by Dr. Bolgar.

VIDIVS, *Metamorphoses* (Bersuire's moralization from the French) by Caxton, 1480] Not an edition but a unique, incomplete manuscript, containing, apart from one or two lacunae, books x-xv. There is no evidence that the translation was ever printed. Dr. Bolgar seems to think—like many other scholars—that Bersuire wrote a French paraphrase of the *Metamorphoses*, which is erroneous.<sup>1</sup> The French counterpart of Caxton's work is *Ovide de Salmonen son liure intitule Methamorphose . . . moralisie par maistre Thomas Waleys* (actually Bersuire) . . . *Translate & Compile par Colard mansion* (1484). Owing to the somewhat misleading title this is almost always described as a French version of Bersuire's *Ovidius moralizatus*, which it is not. Essentially Mansion's book is a prose redaction of the huge French poem called *Ovide moralisé*, but the introductory matter is a translation of Bersuire's prologue and first chapter, and bits of his moralizations are inserted in the text. As regards Caxton's version, made before the printing of Mansion's compilation, there is more in it than that, as I hope to show before long. It is well known, however, that Caxton left out nearly all the moralizing.

(Narcissus) by T. Howell, 1560] The translator, 'T. H.', is almost certainly not identical with Howell.

(Hermaphroditus) by T. Peend, 1568] 1565.

*Ars Amatoria* . . . by T. Heywood, 1598] Undated.

*Remedium Amoris* by T. Heywood, 1598] This translation (of unknown date) is lost, except for some lines incorporated in Heywood's other works. On the two Heywood items see A. M. Clark, 'Thomas Heywood's *Art of Love Lost and Found*', *Library*, 4th series, iii (1922-3), 210-22.

*Tristia* by W. Churchyard] *Thomas Churchyard*.

<sup>1</sup> The *Ovidius moralizatus* is a Latin prose work (actually book xv of Bersuire's *Reductorium morale*) consisting of a prologue, an introductory essay, and fifteen chapters of commentary corresponding to the fifteen books of the *Metamorphoses* with which it was often printed. The *Ovide moralisé* is a French poem of about 70,000 octosyllabics based chiefly on the *Metamorphoses* and other works of Ovid, but including much other matter, such as part of the *Ilias latina*, the whole being immersed in moralizations. For details see F. Ghisalberti, 'L'*Ovidius Moralizatus* di Pierre Bersuire', *Studi romanzi*, xxiii (1933), 5-136; and J. Engels, *Études sur l'Ovide moralisé* (Groningen, 1943).

The whole section on Ovid is inadequate. See esp. D. Bush's masterly *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition* (Minneapolis, 1932; repr. New York, 1957).

SALLUSTIUS, *Catalina* [sic] by T. Paynell] Not the work of Sallust but of Constanzo Felice of Castel Durante (1518).

SENECA (THE YOUNGER)] Even if not by Seneca the *Octavia* translated by T. Nuce (1566) should have found a place here. Dr. Bolgar has missed the translation (by E. Aggas?) of extracts from the letters and some of the philosophical works appended to the version of de Mornay's *Discours* (as *The Defence of Death*) issued by Aggas in 1576/7. The Seneca material was ready to hand (in French) in de Mornay's book (see M. St. Clare Byrne, 'An Early Translation of Seneca', *Library*, 4th series, iv (1923-4), 277-85. C.B.E.L. is confused on this point).

SOLINUS, *Collectanea* . . . 1587-90] That is, unsold sheets of the only separate edn., that of 1587, were bound up with the Pomponius Mela of 1590.

TERENTIUS, *Andria* . . . by T. Kyffin] Maurice Kyffin.

VEGETIUS, F. R., *de Re Militaris* [sic] Only Sadler's version is referred to. There is a manuscript translation dated 1408 (probably the work of John Walton; see Walton's *Boethius*, ed. M. Science (E.E.T.S. 170, 1927), pp. xlviii-xlix). A verse paraphrase is the anonymous *Knyghthode and Bataile* (1458/9). Leaving aside a partial Scots translation (c. 1500) there is also no mention at this point of Caxton's rendering of the 'boke whiche Christyne of pyse made & drewe out of the boke named vegecius de re militari' and other sources, though Vegetius was a considerably more important source than was Frontinus, under whose name Caxton's translation is to be found.<sup>1</sup>

VERGILIUS, *Aeneis* . . . II by the Earl of Surrey, 1548] There was no edn. earlier than that of 1557.

IV by the Earl of Surrey, 1557] There was an earlier edn., undated but probably printed in 1554.

I-IX by Thomas Phaer] 'The seuen first bookes.'

X-XI by Thomas Phaer] 'The nyne fyrst Bookes . . . with so much of the tenth Booke as coulde be founde.'

*Eclogae* I-X by G. Turberville, 1567] Non-existent. *The Eglogs of the Poet Mantuan turned into English Verse* by Turberville were those of the later and lesser Mantuan poet.

I-X by A. Fleming, 1589] This is Fleming's second version, in rhymeless fourteeners, issued with the *Georgics or Ruralls*. His first translation, in fourteener couplets, was printed in 1575.

II by A. Fraunce, 1591] Slightly revised reprint of the translation incorporated in *The Lawiers Logike* (1588), not mentioned by Dr. Bolgar.

<sup>1</sup> Christine's book is included in the French column; her Vegetius is, however, taken from the translation by Jean de Vignay (c. 1326-50), not mentioned by Dr. Bolgar, who omits, moreover, versions by 'Mastre Richard' (prob. 1254-6; see *Scriptorium*, vi (1952), 39-50, and vii (1953), 262-5) and Jean Priorat (1286-90, a verse adaptation of Jean de Meung), and an anonymous prose translation (1380).

By its very nature a list like that given by Dr. Bolgar can never be exhaustive, as the author himself points out, and no one, I think, is going to blame him for not mentioning such lost versions as Skelton's Cicero (*Ad Familiares*), Grimald's Virgil (*Georgics*), Sidney's Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, I-II), or Drant's Homer (*Iliad*, I-IV). Other omissions are less easy to understand, but of even greater importance is, of course, the number of inaccuracies. Dr. Bolgar's book is a valuable contribution to scholarship, and his Appendix II is certainly not representative of the general level of reliability; still, it might be suggested that not Dr. Simpson but Professor Thomson 'has occasionally been misled by what he read in authorities whom he had every reason to trust'.

HOLGER NØRGAARD

#### WRITING IN SAND IN *TITUS ANDRONICUS* IV. 1

AFTER Lavinia, who cannot speak or write because her ravishers have cut out her tongue and chopped off her hands, has turned the pages of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to the story of Philomel, her Uncle Marcus calls on the gods for help:

*Appollo, Pallas, Ioue or Mercurie,*  
Inspire me that I may this treason finde,  
My Lord looke here, looke here Lauinia,

*He writes his name with his staffe and guides  
it with feete and mouth.*

This sandie plot is plaine,<sup>1</sup> guide if thou canst  
This after me, I haue writ my name,  
Without the help of any hand at all.

Write thou good Neece, and here display at last,  
What God will haue discouered for revenge. . . .

*Shee takes the staffe in her mouth, and guides  
it with her stumps and writes.*

*Stuprum, Chiron, D[e]metrius.*

The stage business here may seem ludicrous or disgusting to modern spectators, though surely it was intended to be pathetic. Elizabethans should have found it easier to be sympathetic, for writing in sand was, perhaps, no stranger to them than writing on a slate when I first went to

<sup>1</sup> I.e. flat. The senses of modern *plain* and *plane* were not differentiated until late in the seventeenth century (see *O.E.D.* under *Plane*, a). Q1 and F1 read *plaine*, and modern editions *plain*; but perhaps *plane* should be substituted.

school. The use of sand in teaching children is thus referred to in Hugh Savage's *Annals of Shakespeare's School*:

Robert [Wyncote] was living in Church Street in 1464. At his coming 4d. was paid to the carpenter who made a 'hovell' to keep sand in next the 'Scholars'. Sand was largely employed in early schools in lieu of copy books. It was placed in slanting shallow desks, moistened and smoothed, and served its purpose fairly well, the scholars writing with a pointed stick. It was thus used within living memory in the small endowed Nonconformist school of Upper Ettington, Warwickshire. [Quoted from the typescript in the Folger Shakespeare Library, p. 12.]

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

*MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR*, III. iii. 176  
(‘UNCAPE’)

THOUGH editors have generally preserved this Folio reading, it gives only a loose sort of sense and is, I believe, an error for ‘untapis’, meaning ‘to come out of cover or hiding’, of which *O.E.D.* cites two examples (1602, 1634). The first of these, ‘at the unkennelling, untapezing, or earthing of the Fox’ (2 *Return Parnassus*), is entirely apposite to Ford’s intention to ‘unkennel the fox’ Falstaff, and the *O.E.D.* examples of the commoner ‘tapis’, meaning ‘to lurk’, ‘lie hid’, corroborate the word’s close association with the chase; see especially the 1592 and 1599 illustrations and ‘tapised’, 1621.

ALICE WALKER

DONNE’S COMPASS

In an earlier issue of this journal Mr. Josef Lederer has suggested that the source of the compass-image as it occurs in Donne’s ‘A Valediction: forbidding mourning’, may lie in Guarini’s ‘Riposta dell’ Amante’ (published Venice, 1598), a madrigal in which a lover similarly likens himself and his mistress to the moving and the fixed legs of a compass. The raw image of the compass itself, Mr. Lederer feels, was taken by Guarini from the device—a compass inscribing a circle upon a tablet—which was used by the sixteenth-century Belgian printer Christophe Plantin.<sup>1</sup> There is

<sup>1</sup> Josef Lederer, ‘John Donne and the Emblematic Practice’, *R.E.S.*, xxii (1946), 198 f. Cf. also, for the Guarini-Donne relationship, D. C. Allen, ‘Donne’s Compass Figure’, *M.L.N.*, lxxi (1956), 256-7.

also the possibility, however, that though Donne may have modelled the closing stanzas of the 'Valediction' upon Guarini's poem, he had direct knowledge of the Plantin device himself—and well before the composition of his poem about 1612—from books in his own library printed at the Plantin presses. I should like to suggest here, and offer certain evidence, that Donne knew the device and was using it poetically as early as the period 1593–7.

That Donne was a collector of books is evident from the growing list of titles in his library now being gathered, notably by Sir Geoffrey Keynes and Mr. John Sparrow. Mr. Sparrow has commented upon the fact that an exceedingly small number of the known Donne volumes have publication dates after 1615; the large number of titles so far ascertained (approaching 200) suggests, then, that Donne acquired heavily during his earlier years.<sup>1</sup> Among the titles of volumes believed to have been owned by Donne, a quick check turns up at least two with the Plantin device:

Manutius, Aldus, *Epitome Orthographiae*. Antwerp, 1579.<sup>2</sup>

Pighius, Stephanus Vinandus, *Annales Magistratum et Provinciarum SPQR*. 1599.<sup>3</sup>

Turning then to Donne's early poems, one finds imagery in some abundance drawn from the fields of astronomy, astrology, and allied disciplines such as magic, to which the geometric figure is essential. Among the *Songs and Sonets*, 'The Good-Morrow', 'A Valediction: of the booke', 'A Valediction: of weeping', and 'The Ecstasie' utilize the circle metaphorically, and in 'Love's Growth' there occurs the circle-with-central-point which becomes so meaningful a figure in the later poems and sermons. Examination of the *Elegies* similarly shows Donne's interest in the expressive value of the circle; 'The Bracelet', 'Love's Progress', and 'Going to Bed' all incorporate this image.

It is in 'Love's Progress' that I find the suggestion that Donne was acquainted with the Plantin device itself. The device, it will be recalled, is in the form of a scene: a hand holding the compass is thrust downward through clouds to inscribe a circle on a tablet below. The whole is accompanied by the motto LABORE ET CONSTANTIA. In the poem, there begins at line 73 a passage which is developed as a series of variations upon the theme: a woman's foot. Among them, at line 79, one reads:

It is the Emblem that hath figured  
Firmness. . . .

This might be a difficult allusion to identify, as the emblem books (at first

<sup>1</sup> John Sparrow, 'Donne's Books in the Middle Temple', *T.L.S.*, 29 July 1955, p. 436.

<sup>2</sup> Item 314 in Geoffrey Keynes, *A Bibliography of John Donne* (Cambridge, 1932) p. 177.

<sup>3</sup> Described in Sparrow, 'More Donne', *T.L.S.*, 13 March 1953, p. 169.

thought, the most likely reference) do not yield evidence of having been the source of the figure. In the Plantin device, though, the fixed foot (or more accurately, leg) of the compass, according to the motto, not only clearly represents Constantia but, in some of the forms the device took, has the word *Constantia* inscribed on one of its sides.

It would seem, then, that Donne was indebted to various sources for the components of the ideas mentioned here. Mr. Rugoff is undoubtedly correct in tracing Donne's stock of imagery from the field of geometry ultimately to his schoolboy studies in Euclid.<sup>1</sup> The compass as a poetic figure, I have attempted to show, may very likely have recommended itself to him from one of the Plantin title-pages; and its use in 'Love's Progress' is casual, an easy allusion merely gracing a structure itself built up, incidentally, of imagery from cartography and navigation, two additional fields to which geometry is fundamental. Then, when in Guarini's poem he encountered the compass as representative of a human spiritual bond, he recognized the complex of more serious ideas with which it might be made to resonate—and, adopting the figure, made it produce additional overtones in his own poem. And as the student of Donne's imagery knows, the related forms—compass and circle—continued to do expressive service throughout Donne's creative career, deepening in their significance as the poet continued to find ever richer metaphoric value in them.

DORIS C. POWERS

<sup>1</sup> Milton A. Rugoff, *Donne's Imagery* (New York, 1939), p. 65.

## REVIEWS

**Bibliography of the Eddas.** By JOHANN S. HANNESSON. Pp. xiv + 110 (*Islandica* 37). Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1955; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 32s. net.

This volume is issued as a supplement to Vol. XIII of *Islandica* and continues the bibliography of the Eddas from 1920 to (presumably) 1954. Some publications of 1954 are included, but not all. The arrangement of Vol. XIII is followed, and certain improvements make the present bibliography even easier to use. Items are spaciouly set and numbered; cross reference is more precise and thorough. A guiding comment is given if the exact content of a work is not apparent from the title. There is a full, accurate index of authors and reviewers. Mr. Hannesson has carried out his task with meticulous care and thought. Though his method as described in the Preface may seem puzzling ('Works on both Eddas are as a rule entered under *Sæmundar Edda*, with cross references from *Snorra Edda* except in the case of works dealing with subjects common to both Eddas'), it does not prove so in practice.

It is not easy to compile an adequate bibliography of the Eddas and keep it within reasonable bounds. Many works on Germanic mythology and heroic poetry are relevant to the Eddas. Mr. Hannesson has perhaps been too severe in his exclusion of 'general works in related fields'. Certainly it is not always clear why he should include one work and not another. H. V. Routh, *God, man, and epic poetry* is included, while J. De Vries, *Altgermanische Religionsgeschichte* is expressly omitted, although this is a far more valuable and learned work, of direct relevance to the mythological poems, and contains an excellent bibliography, a useful supplement to the bibliography of the Eddas (cf. some of Reitzenstein's work, which is relevant to *Völuspá*). Similarly it is difficult to see why the sections of H. Schneider, *Germanische Heldensage*, which deal specifically with certain poems of the Edda, should not be mentioned. Since general works, such as H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, are included, reference might also be made to C. M. Bowra, *Heroic Poetry* (London, 1952), which is intended to be a continuation of the Chadwicks' work and contains numerous references to the Elder Edda.

Professor Hermannsson regarded his bibliography of the Eddas as 'in a certain way a complement to the Bibliography of the Mythical-Heroic sagas published in 1912.' Inevitably these bibliographies will overlap. Most works on *Sigurð* and the Burgundians are relevant to the Eddas, to *Völsunga Saga*, and to the *Nibelungenlied*. It would have been helpful if Mr. Hannesson had explained more fully the relationship between his bibliography (see his footnote, p. 19) and that of *Völsunga Saga* and *Piðreks Saga* in *Islandica*, Vol. XXVI (1937). He repeats a few relevant items, but excludes substantial works (by Heusler and Schütte, for example) that many will think have equal claim. Reference might have been made to the exhaustive bibliography of M. Thorp in *The Study of the Nibelungenlied* (Oxford, 1940), and her interesting supplementary article: M. Fleet,

'The Recent Study of the Nibelungenlied', in *J.E.G.P.*, lii (1953). Both contain items (works by F. Panzer and H. Schneider, for instance) which Mr. Hannesson has been obliged to exclude, but which have relevance to problems of the Eddas. P. Herrmann, *Die Heldensagen des Saxo Grammaticus*, II, Kommentar (Leipzig, 1922), contains some discussion of Eddic poems, particularly the Helgi lays and *Hamðismál*, and also deserves reference.

Two omissions are perhaps accidental: Jón Helgason, *Norges og Islands digtning* (*Nordisk Kultur*, viii b, Uppsala, 1952); and Finnur Jónsson, *Den Islandske Grammatiks Historie til o. 1800* (København, 1933), which sets the Grammatical Treatises, briefly, in their place in the history of grammatical writing.

These criticisms are not meant to disparage the excellence of Mr. Hannesson's achievement. He has carried on extremely ably the work of a great and experienced bibliographer. The fullness, clarity, and thoroughness of the volume will make it invaluable to both scholars and amateurs of the subject.

URSULA BROWN

**Britain in Medieval French Literature 1100-1500.** By P. RICKARD. Pp. x+282. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 35s. net.

Studies of French influence on medieval English literature are numerous, but (examination of the 'Matter of Britain' apart) this is the first extended study of the influence of Britain on medieval French literature. Dr. Rickard's survey covers four centuries and a wide range of sources, including *chansons de geste*, romances, biographies, chronicles, and political and humorous poems. He deals with every kind of reference, from the merest mention of England or Englishmen to full-length biographies of eminent personages. The influence of Scotland and Ireland is carefully examined in separate chapters. Little, if anything, of importance can have been missed.

Dr. Rickard is concerned wholly with influence on subject-matter, since he finds that there is practically no influence on French literary form. He is concerned to show what is there and, if possible, why it is there. If the English are humorously portrayed as drunkards and speakers of execrable French, it is because the average Frenchman knew the English only as soldiers occupying parts of France; if English cowardice or treachery is emphasized, we must look for the reason in the political situation. Dr. Rickard makes the point that Britain was both near enough and distant enough to make a suitable setting for romantic adventures; and the ambivalence of Britain's position may be seen in other respects. It was near enough for some writers to take a close interest in contemporary events there, distant enough for some to be able to assert maliciously that the English had tails.

Some aspects of the subject have been discussed before, and Dr. Rickard carefully brings together the results of previous research. The 'Matter of Britain', of course, overshadows everything else, and accounts for a fifth of the book. So much has been written about it that it is difficult to find anything new to say, and Dr. Rickard's treatment is rather a useful work of synthesis than a piece of original research. He has chosen to treat problems of origin and transmission

in some detail but in a small space, and this leads to acute compression and formidable footnotes. These pages are not easy reading, but they do present the non-specialist with a convenient summary of the problems and their suggested solutions.

Throughout his study Dr. Rickard seeks to establish whether or not an author's references to England spring from genuine knowledge of the country. In his chapter on the romances of adventure, one of his methods is to examine descriptions of journeys made to or in England for accuracy of detail. He is able to conclude that Beaumanoir knew England, while the author of *Jouffrois* did not. This kind of examination is valuable for its purpose, but, having made his point, Dr. Rickard does not go much farther, though there is more that could be discussed. It is true that in his treatment of Beaumanoir's *Jehan et Blonde* he pays due attention to the Count of Gloucester and his bad French, though, in contrasting him with the well-spoken Count of Oxford, he misses Beaumanoir's remark that the Count of Oxford had been in France to learn (ed. Suchier, ll. 131-2). But he does not fully discuss Beaumanoir's use of his English setting, whether, for example, he draws on first-hand experience of life in a nobleman's household, or merely gives a conventional romantic picture. Again, no one would guess from Dr. Rickard's account of *Jouffrois* that the hero is a gay Don Juan, and that in the final episode, when he is hoping to enjoy the favours of the Queen of England, he and his companion, Robert, are involved with the queen in a *fabliau* type of situation. This is surely not entirely irrelevant; and since it has been briefly remarked on an earlier page that the hero of a much less familiar romance, *Palanus, conte de Lyon*, eventually becomes the lover of the English queen, the reader is provoked to ask questions. Does the situation in *Palanus* in any way resemble the situation in *Jouffrois*? How is the character of the queen presented in these romances?

The texture of the book necessarily varies with the nature of the evidence. Under some of Dr. Rickard's headings there is a mass of detail to be managed; under others the material is thin, and he is able to devote several pages to the analysis of one work. But this is never an easily readable book. There is a certain satisfaction to be had from seeing a mass of material efficiently ordered, summarized, and docketed, but it is a limited satisfaction. This study is essentially a collection of facts, and facts need to be presented with skill and with a certain passion if they are to hold the interest. Dr. Rickard's style is flat and impersonal; he does not communicate to the reader his own fascination with the subject. On one notable page of his conclusion he relaxes, and briefly reviews the character-drawing in some works examined earlier in the book. The liveliness and insight of his remarks made me regret that he did not allow his personality to appear more often. Nevertheless, there can be no doubt that his book will be indispensable to workers in his field.

After some checking of a few immediately accessible texts, I find that references are accurate, but in the quotations from Old French there are some minor divergences from the printed versions. There is a useful, but not exhaustive, index.

MARJORY RIGBY

**The Equatorie of the Planetis.** Edited from Peterhouse MS. 75. I by DEREK J. PRICE, with a linguistic analysis by R. M. WILSON. Cambridge: University Press, 1955. 52s. 6d. net.

The manuscript here edited is of considerable interest for at least two reasons: first as an account of a scientific instrument in the fourteenth century, and secondly as a text in Middle English possibly written by Chaucer. The volume, which is admirably produced, contains a facsimile, transcription, and translation of the text, and a full discussion of its provenance, authorship, and significance in the history of science and of the English language.

As a scientific instrument the *equatorium planetarum* was complementary to the astrolabe. Both were designed so that figures relating to the apparent positions of the heavenly bodies in the sky could be read off the instrument itself, thus greatly reducing the very tedious amount of arithmetical computation otherwise required. The astrolabe was used for determining the positions of the sun and the stars, and the *equatorium* those of the moon and the planets. The *equatorium* was in fact a sort of giant discoidal slide-rule, and the instrument described here faithfully reproduces the geometrical construction demanded by Ptolemaic planetary theory. One of the best sections of Mr. Price's discussion is his very clear exposition of the Ptolemaic system, which, it should be realized, was the geometrical equivalent of the Copernican system and equally accurate. (The main objections to be brought against it were from the side of physical theory rather than observation.) In another excellent section he gives a history of the *equatorium*. Invented in the early eleventh century by Abulqasim of Granada, it was improved later in the same century by another Arabic mathematician, al-Zarqali of Toledo, and further improved in the Latin West in the early fourteenth century by John of Linières and by Richard of Wallingford. The instrument underwent parallel developments in the East. Only two incomplete examples of the actual instrument are known, whereas about 1,000 examples of Western and Eastern astrolabes are preserved in museums and private collections.

It seems clear that the present text was based on a Latin translation of an Arabic original, though neither of these has been identified. The astronomical tables it contains are a simple modification of the Alfonsine Tables, prepared at Toledo about 1272 for King Alfonso the Wise of Castile, and here adapted for the longitude of London. A statement near the beginning of the text, and evidence from the tables, agree on a date of composition about 1392. This is near the probable date of composition of Chaucer's *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, which contains worked examples for the year 1391. Did Chaucer also write the *Equatorie*? The circumstantial evidence is certainly sufficient to make the question worth asking. Mr. Price summarizes it clearly and fairly, but wisely leaves the answer undecided. Professor Wilson concludes from his linguistic analysis that there is nothing in the language or style of the text against an ascription to Chaucer. It seems probable that the author knew the *Treatise on the Astrolabe*. In favour of a common authorship are the evidence for the manuscript's being an author's holograph and for the date, the common technical terms and phrases, and a note, 'defferentia Christi et radix Chaucer', on one of the tables which

Mr. Price argues to mean that the difference between the year of Christ and the *radix*, or date taken as the standard origin for the tables, is 1392. No document or autograph certainly written by Chaucer is known, but the writing of the word 'Chaucer' here is closely similar to that of the name in a legal document of 1378 in the Public Record Office which may well be in his hand. That is as far as the evidence goes. It would, of course, be of great importance to English medievalists if this text should prove to come from the hand of Chaucer. Leaving that question aside, it is also an interesting document in the history of science.

A. C. CROMBIE

In view of the importance of this text it is desirable to consider more closely the editors' treatment of the language.

The transcription, in which 'editorial interference . . . has been kept to the minimum permitted by normal typography', is good but not perfect. I have noticed only one trifling misreading, *foreseide* for *forseide* G/17, and even this is given correctly in the glossary. There are a few inconsistencies in the use of capitals: *R* of the manuscript is transcribed in lower case six times, *P* twice; *j* appears as *I* when it is the pronoun but *j* in *justli* F/7, and *Ʒ* is similarly split into *I* generally but *Ʒ* in *Ʒuppiter* G/1. More important, the expansion of abbreviations, and the palaeographical notes about them on pp. 134-5, may sometimes be questioned. For example, there is nothing to be said for reading *equacoun* G/9 (considered as 'probably due to an error by the writer', p. 138), for *-con* with a stroke above is very frequent at this date for *-cion*; *manere* D/4 ends with a common type of flourished *r* of which it cannot be said that 'the *r* has been written in'; *-tʒ* should not be expanded to *-tis*, as *defferentis* E/54, &c., for many such spellings are shown by metre, in Chaucer and other writers, to imply no extra syllable. It is not clear why the common final loop, which can take the place of *-es* or *-is/-ys*, is regularly expanded to *-is* though the plural when written in full ends mostly in *-es* (*-is* also occurs). This in itself matters little, but it leads to some unnecessary mystification in the section on accident (p. 141), where we read that 'variation appears in *equantis* E/53, H/17, but *equantes* C/12; *mynutis* E/59, D/4, *minutis* N/5, but *mynutes* A/29'. Every one of these forms in *-is* is abbreviated in the manuscript, and it is impossible to say whether the writer intended 'variation' or not. There is an unfortunate rendering of *ymagiēs* in the heading of a table of stars (p. 91): it is expanded to *Ymagicorum [stellarum fixarum]*, though what this is supposed to mean is not explained.

Professor Wilson's linguistic apparatus usefully summarizes the main features of the text. The glossary is the best part, admirably full and mostly accurate. There are some insufficient etymologies, such as OE. *onsegn* for *agayn*, and a few wrong glosses, such as *for* B/31 'because of' when it means 'to avoid', and *passit* N/33 taken as past instead of present. *Astrik* in the sentence *mak a marke astrik in the label* E/2 is glossed 'crosswise', but this does not suit either etymology (OE. *on+strica* 'stroke') or context (which continues *Ɔ fasteby the strik writ .sa.*). It seems to be simply *strik* with the indefinite article, in apposition to *a marke*, much as in Chaucer's *Astrolabe*, II. 38; *draw a strike, euene alyne fro the pyn*. . . .

Parts of the 'Linguistic Analysis' might have been better arranged. In particular, the heading 'Phonology' is made to cover a great deal that concerns spelling, not sound. Sometimes this is explicit, as 'Initially *u* is represented by *o*'; but not always: *o* in words like *com* is attributed to 'a following nasal', when it is the minim cluster, not the sound, that matters. Formulations such as 'OE. *ū* is usually *ow* . . .', but *ou* appears in *aboutē*, or 'The consonant has been doubled medially in *shollen*' may mislead when placed under this heading. Where there is an important problem of attribution of the text, as there is here, spelling deserves a section to itself. In it attention might be drawn to one or two things not expressly remarked on here, notably the regular use of simple *h* for the spirant before *t* in words like *myht* and *tawhte*, which at this date is unusual enough to be of possible help in identifying a writer. (It is noteworthy that the same practice strongly predominates, but is not quite regular, in Cambridge University Library MS. Dd. 3. 53 of the *Astrolabe*.) Under spelling, too, should probably come *-eng* in *signefyng*, which is certainly not a mistake as Mr. Wilson suggests. This use of *-eng* is very common throughout the fifteenth century (another example close at hand is *tarieng(e)* in both the C.U.L. Dd. 3. 53 and the Bodley 619 manuscripts of the *Astrolabe*, II. 25); it appears nearly always (not exclusively) in verbs ending in *-y*, which suggests that it was meant to avoid the writing of double *i* or *y*.<sup>1</sup> Certain matters that do concern phonology are insufficiently considered. For instance, the variation between *descende* and *discende*, *deuysioun* and *diuisioun*, is lumped together with that in *defferent* and *different* as 'in a stressed syllable', which it is not; and it is not helpful to remark that 'Before *h* *a* is found in *say* ['saw']', when there is no *h* in sight (nor can there ever have been in the ancestor of this form). This section, then, must be used with care and is no place to turn undergraduates loose; but it is not, after all, intended for them and scholars will see what is meant. The section on Accidence is not quite complete: under Verbs, for instance, *lorn* (a Chaucerian form) is not noticed.

The editor says on p. 3 that if this text could be shown to be an autograph of Chaucer's it 'might have great use in textual criticism of the Chaucer canon'. When Mr. Wilson comes to compare the results of his inquiry with what is precisely known of Chaucer's usage he is obliged to emphasize how meagre this is. Reservations must be made not only about corruptions due to scribes but also about the pressure of rhyme: on the one hand a rhyme must often preserve Chaucer's sound, but on the other he may have used for the sake of rhyme forms that were not normal to his ordinary speech or prose writing. It may be added that other considerations may also have to be reckoned with; the forms appropriate to 'heigh style', or to the freedom of the Host or the Miller, need not be those that would come naturally in an astronomical essay. Mr. Wilson's cautious conclusion is that 'there is certainly nothing in the language or style of the *Equatorie* which is definitely against Chaucerian authorship'. That is, the language is reasonably like what is already thought to be 'Chaucerian'. And from this necessary vagueness it follows, disappointingly, that even if this manuscript

<sup>1</sup> But Luick, *Historische Grammatik*, § 460. 2d, believes it to indicate lowering. He dates it first in the fifteenth century, but rare examples of the same kind of thing can be seen as early as *Owl and Nightingale*, C. 614 *wnienge*.

could be proved to be in Chaucer's hand it would make little decisive difference to the textual criticism of his poetry.

It would all the same have been possible, and desirable, to get a little closer to the problem. I take two obvious examples: the plural of 'shall' and the verb 'work'. In the *Equatorie* the plural of 'shall' is *shal* four times and *shollen* five. Though good Chaucerian manuscripts similarly have two forms, that with the distinctively plural vowel seems to be always *shul*, *shuln*, *shullen* (or *sch-*); the spelling *shollen* is in fact not common anywhere—*O.E.D.* does not record it. But this is not a word that can be checked in rhyme and it may have been disturbed by scribes, though if it were Chaucer's common form it is perhaps strange that it should be so thoroughly obliterated. 'Work' is more profitable. The *Equatorie* has *wirk(e)* and *wyrk* (infin., 1 sg. pres., and imper.) five times, *workest* (2 sg. pres.) once, and nothing else—never *werche*, *worche*, or *werke*. Now in Chaucer's poems it is remarkable that every time the verb 'work' occurs in rhyme (ten times, if we exclude *R.R.* 6662) it has the form *wirche* or *werche* and rhymes with *chirche/cherche*. (The noun in rhyme is always *werk(e)*, rhyming *clerk*, *derk*, *hawberk*, *merk*.) Outside rhyme the manuscripts vary greatly, and it does not seem possible to reach any conclusion from them about Chaucer's authority for *wirche*, *werche*, *worche*, *wirke*, *werke*, or *worke*. (But it may be noted that the *C.U.L. Dd.* 3. 53 *Astrolabe* has *wyrk-* eight times, *werk-* three, *worke* once, and no *-che* forms.) If the *Equatorie* were in Chaucer's hand, it would be of interest that his prose form of this verb should be quite distinct from his rhyming form. It is worth noting too that though the final consonant is influenced by the noun the vowel is not, except in the single *workest*, and the form *werke*, so characteristic of his rhymes with the noun, does not occur.

Mr. Wilson remarks (p. 146) that there appears to be a very close similarity between the language of the *Equatorie* and that of the *C.U.L. Dd.* 3. 53 *Astrolabe*. This is true, and readers would have welcomed a detailed demonstration of it instead of having to work it out for themselves. I have pointed out above four of the more unusual things that have struck me (*astrik*, *myht*, *-eng*, *wyrke*); and I would add another from the sphere of vocabulary. Mr. Wilson notes (p. 137) that *bakside*, recorded by *O.E.D.* from 1489, appears in the *Equatorie*; but so it does in the *Astrolabe* (I. 15, II. 3), as is now recorded in the new *M.E.D.*

We may never know for sure what part Chaucer had in the *Equatorie*. That he was connected with it seems certain, for there is no other adequate explanation of the occurrence of his name.<sup>1</sup> The hand of the manuscript is very like that of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. G. Herdan, in his article 'Chaucer's Authorship of the *Equatorie* of the Planetis', *Language*, xxxii (1956), 254-9, shows that the percentage (37) of Romance words in the *Equatorie* is almost exactly what we should expect in a text of this length from the statistics of Chaucer's work as a whole (37.8). But he fails to notice that one does not write an astronomical treatise in terms of poetic narrative. In a work where Chaucer had to manipulate technical terms like *aux*, *canon*, *centre deffluent*, *epicicle*, *equacioun*, and the rest, he could not be expected to use the same proportion of Romance words as he would in the plainer style of the *Miller's Tale*; and it is in fact surprising that the *Wife of Bath's Prologue*, which is about the same length as the *Equatorie*, should have almost the same percentage of Romance words. The only one of Chaucer's works genuinely comparable in matter, though longer, is the *Astrolabe*, and its percentage of Romance words is 45.25.

the P.R.O. document, not only in the name but in almost all the letter-forms—strikingly so considering that the two were written about fourteen years apart. Admittedly the document is a mere scrap, and the hand is not particularly distinctive; yet it seems more likely than not that both it and the *Equatorie* are in Chaucer's hand. Whatever may come of it, all students of the period will be permanently indebted to Dr. Price, Mr. Wilson, and their publishers.

N. D.

**Studies on Chaucer and his Audience.** By MARY GIFFIN. Pp. 130. Hull, Quebec: Les Éditions L'Éclair, 1956. \$4.75.

The relation between the medieval poet and his audience has received some attention of recent years, and it is good to have this careful study by Miss Giffin in which she suggests the kind of audience or the particular persons for whom she believes Chaucer's poems may have been written. The profession of letters in the Middle Ages was at least as precarious as in later times, and it was well nigh impossible for a poet to write without thought of who was to receive (and pay for) his writings. Since most writers were clerics, their living was reasonably ensured by some office or other in the Church and their writings were readily absorbed in conventual and ecclesiastical libraries, or treasured with a few other volumes by religiously minded people—lay or cleric.

Secular literature was not in so happy a position, for unless the writer had a patron or an audience that could be relied on to reward him for his pains he could not live by writing. The fourteenth century saw a change in these conditions by the advent of the 'amateur' author—that is, a man like Chaucer—who did not depend on his writings for a living but served the Muses by night after serving Mammon by day. This does not mean to say that such a writer lacked an eye for the main chance (see Hoccleve, for example), or that he wrote entirely to please himself. Chaucer, clearly made use of his aristocratic connexions, as can be seen from *The Book of the Duchess* or *The Legend of Good Women*, while the illustration which is found at the beginning of the Corpus Christi Cambridge manuscript of *Troilus and Criseyde* shows the kind of audience Chaucer envisaged in writing that poem.

It is with some such considerations as these in mind that Miss Giffin has attempted to determine the individual or the social group for whom Chaucer wrote on various occasions. To take her first example: Miss Giffin suggests that the 'Second Nun's Tale' of St. Cecile might have been written in 1383 so that Richard II could present it to his hosts, the Benedictines of Norwich, where Adam Easton had been a monk before he became a Cardinal priest of St. Cecilia in Trastevere, and therefore it is suggested that 'a poem honoring Easton's title of Santa Cecilia might have been persuasive toward obtaining the English cardinal's assistance in a difficult dispute with the Papacy'.

As we try to peer back into the misty politics of the fourteenth century Miss Giffin's surmises (supported as they are by an impressive marshalling of facts) are as good as another's. If my own preference is for a verdict of 'Not proven' this is in no way a criticism of her more adventurous literary scholarship. Her

various examples, however, require just that much more credulity than some of us will be willing to give. But no one who studies her four essays on various poems will fail to enjoy the skill and resourcefulness of her position, or to realize how much we still have to learn before we can see Chaucer as did his instructed contemporaries.

H. S. BENNETT

**Scottish Poetry. A Critical Survey.** Edited by JAMES KINSLEY. Pp. x+330. London: Cassell, 1955. 30s. net.

This is a book that was lacking—in its own words, ‘a survey of Scottish poetry which takes account of modern scholarship and extends to our own time’. Agnes Mure Mackenzie’s *Survey*, which in any case did not confine itself to poetry and did not extend beyond 1714, is already over twenty years old, and other surveys on the same sort of scale are either fifty or a hundred years old.

Professor Kinsley writes in his Preface that he and his team are ‘mainly concerned with poetry written in Scots and English; but an essay on the Latinists has been included, partly to complete the picture of poetic activity in Renaissance Scotland and partly to underline the long Scottish love of things Latin’. There is, on the other hand, among the essays no survey of Gaelic poetry, since that ‘would have increased the cost of the book out of all proportion to demand’; but a concluding note by Mr. Douglas Young ‘illustrates the scope and quality of Gaelic verse, and the part played by Gaelic poets in the modern “renaissance”’. One cannot dispute the editor’s practical judgement of the cost of a Gaelic survey, but, since his book is concerned with ‘the critical assessment of our best poets rather than with that cultural history’ for which in any case provision is still too slender, one may wonder, in complete ignorance of Gaelic, whether Mr. Young can be so far out in his assessment of the Gaelic poets that his seven pages are in anything like a decent proportion to the thirty which Professor Adams has been allowed for the Latinists. Not but what Mr. Adams’s pages are very welcome as perhaps the fullest and now certainly the handiest account of their subject.

His Preface done, the editor leads off with an account of the ‘Mediaeval Makars’ up to Dunbar—clear, learned, and well documented, and in these ways setting a standard which the members of his team are generally successful in their different ways in maintaining. Agnes Mure Mackenzie comes next with an essay on ‘The Renaissance Poets, Scots and English’, beginning with Gavin Douglas and ending with Drummond of Hawthornden. Whether the line between Mediaeval Makars and Renaissance Poets is best drawn between Dunbar and Douglas is perhaps open to question; but after Drummond a good many lines may be drawn, and the insertion here of Mr. Adams on the Latinists, as well as Sir James Fergusson on ‘The Ballads’, before Mrs. A. M. Oliver on ‘The Scottish Augustans’ and Dr. Daiches on ‘Eighteenth Century Vernacular Poetry’ may reflect the idea that a break in European history is more marked about 1700 than about 1500, and it certainly points the fact that in Scotland by 1700 a continuous poetic activity of 300 years had come to an end. On ballads Sir James Fergusson says all that need be said about their origins, describes their kinds, and devotes the latter

part of his essay to an illuminating account, illustrated by quotations, of the relationship between the language of the ballads and that of the historical records of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mrs. Oliver and Dr. Daiches deal understandingly with the recovery and re-creation of poetry in a Scotland where the uses of English and the Vernacular were clearly, though not simply, related to social and cultural differences crossed by strands of wider and narrower patriotism. Robert Dewar, in 'Burns and the Burns Tradition', writes with unusual authority. Apart from his studies, he knew from the inside, as no other man his junior is now ever likely to know, Burns's local world, and he has no doubt that it was in that world and before he visited Edinburgh that Burns made himself and was made. The best thing Edinburgh did for Burns was to introduce him to James Johnson, and it was in the songs he wrote for Johnson and later for Thomson that he proved himself to be, what he almost took pains to conceal in all editions of his *Poems* in his own lifetime, 'the most exquisite artist in folksong the world has seen'. Dr. John Oliver's main task in 'Scottish Poetry in the Earlier Nineteenth Century' is to place Sir Walter Scott, which he does with his accustomed skill. 'It is as a lyric poet that Scott is at his greatest, and that greatness', Dr. Oliver thinks, 'has not been sufficiently recognized.' The thought nevertheless is not new; it is in fact expressed rather often; a little oftener and it will thereby and happily cease to be true. Mr. Young in his essay on 'Scottish Poetry in the Later Nineteenth Century' is concerned with what he calls 'a miscellaneous bag of versifiers'. That is hard: too hard on Stevenson, too hard on John Davidson; but doubtless not too hard on most of the people mentioned in the essay. Why then mention them? The trouble is that some of their verses are memorable in a humble way and have come to represent an enormous mass of material which the literary historian cannot quite bring himself to ignore but does not quite know how to interpret, though the cultural historian could make much play with it and some of 'The Modern Makars', on whom Dr. Kitchin writes the last essay, have their own notions what it all implied. This last essay must have been one of the most troublesome to write since in the nature of things it tends to run out with a rather inconclusive list of names; but in fact it is held together by the unfailing sympathy of the author for verse that is alive and by his assurance that there has indeed been a renaissance.

The book is very readable; it is very reliable; but as an up-to-date survey it ought also to be very usable, and it is doubtful if its apparatus is the best that could have been devised for that purpose. The table of contents displays the scheme of the book; the index is a full list of personal names and names of anonymous poems; but the notes, placed at the end with an enumeration for each chapter, are rather too much of a miscellany. They comprise references, asides, supplementary remarks, and biographical and bibliographical entries. The bibliographical matter in particular might have been more systematically presented, or, at least, as systematically for all chapters as it is for some.

The editor hopes to follow this with a similar survey of the Scottish novel and the drama. Readers are likely to hope that he will.

WILLIAM PARK

**Doctrine for the Lady of the Renaissance.** By RUTH KELSO. Pp. xii+476. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956. \$6.50.

Dr. Kelso is an experienced worker in the literature that can be loosely subsumed under the heading of 'Courtesy'. She embarked on the present study in order to supplement her *Doctrine of the English Gentleman in the Sixteenth Century* but found that the meagreness of purely English material compelled a survey of Continental doctrine through two centuries, 1400-1600. 'Everything in the book,' says the author modestly, 'except a few gratuitous remarks of my own, has been taken from others . . . in snippets . . . which had to be woven into coherent discourse.' The book offers itself, therefore, as a compilation (in translation) from a literature which was already very largely compilation or recompilation from a host of sources from the classics onwards. In this connexion the Preface should be carefully read to prepare the reader for the system of reference and occasional quotation (as distinct from epitome) adopted here.

Dr. Kelso was not long in discovering that, for another reason, no neatly complementary volume to her *English Gentleman* could be forthcoming. She insists more than once on the paradox that this massive volume (475 pages, 282 of text, 193 of Notes, an important Bibliography and three Indexes) is devoted to something that is not there. There is no doctrine for the 'Lady' as an entity in her own right; the framers of doctrine could not think beyond the woman or, more specifically, the wife, graduating from subservience in her father's house to dependence in her husband's, at best a helpmeet, at worst a temptation and enigma provided by an inscrutable Providence for the continuance of the race. Of course, we all have in mind some idealized types of Renaissance lady from literature or some examples from history, but with these this book is not concerned. Its business is with 'doctrine' or theory—of nurture, habits, duties, character, and desirable qualities.

The theorists here epitomized contribute to four main themes: the 'war of the sexes' (ch. ii), the training and duties of the wife (ch. iii to ch. v), Love and Beauty (ch. vi), the Court (ch. vii). The Conclusion summarizes but also opens up one or two fresh questions, for example the bearing of some religious factors on the doctrine. Ch. vi, on Love and Beauty, is perhaps the section most relevant to the literature—at least to the love-poetry and the more romantic fiction. It is irradiated by Platonic and chivalric gleams and warmed by some potential give-and-take between the sexes. For the rest, apart from an odd champion here and there, we listen to a succession of authors preaching down from a hoard of maxims by no means little the heart of every daughter of Eve.

The question of the purpose or destination of such a laborious enterprise obtrudes itself. It is not literary or social history; it is cut off from creation or reality. It can be classified as a background study in the history of ideas. Its destination is clearly the university or college library, where it may enlighten the *very* industrious student as to age-long pressures on the female half of the population and explain some hitherto puzzling features and assumptions in literature and life.

The book is heavy in the hand; it is scarcely intended for reading through in

the ordinary way, yet I did not find it dull. It has been firmly organized and lucidly written. Moreover, as Miss Rose Macaulay revealed to us many years ago, *Women are News*. From the harsher *exempla* and injunctions the feminist can nourish a rich anger and the misogynist fortify his complacency. The realist may be a trifle starved, but the ironist can find plenty to feed his humour.

G. D. WILLCOCK

**Shakespeare's Appian. A Selection from the Tudor Translation of Appian's Civil Wars.** Edited by ERNEST SCHANZER. Pp. xxviii + 102 (Liverpool Reprints 13). Liverpool: University Press, 1956. 6s. net.

MacCallum (*Shakespeare's Roman Plays*, pp. 647-8) was not convinced that Shakespeare used Appian in the writing of *Julius Caesar*, but with *Antony and Cleopatra* did not think there could be 'any serious doubt about Shakespeare's having consulted the 1578 translation of the *Bella Civilia*'. In his Introduction Mr. Schanzer attempts to demonstrate connexions between *Julius Caesar* and Appian, centring his argument on the portrayal of Antony. He also suggests that the translator was William Barker (only the initials W. B. appear in the book), and gives useful information regarding the sources of the English version.

The selection of extracts presents many difficulties, especially where a secondary source for so perfunctory a reader as Shakespeare is concerned. Some passages have to be included or excluded on the most tenuous evidence. The *Continuation* of the *Civil Wars*, for instance, part of the volume of 1578, is dropped in Mr. Schanzer's reprint, presumably on the ground that it condensed Plutarch's *Marcus Antonius*, which was in Shakespeare's hands in any case: but, abridged though it is, the *Continuation* offers some verbal parallels to *Antony and Cleopatra*, where Plutarch reads differently. A few examples will suffice.

1. Antony tells Eros to kill him:

- (a) *Doo't, the time is come* (*A. & C.*, iv. xii. 67);
- (b) and then he willed him to keepe his promise (Plutarch, ed. 1595);
- (c) Now (saith he) *is the time for thee to do it* (Appian, p. 392).

2. Antony's grievances against Caesar:

- (a) *Then does he say, he lent me*  
Some shipping *vnrrestor'd* (*A. & C.*, iii. vi. 26-27);
- (b) Secondly, that he did detain in his hands the shippes he lent him to make that warre (Plutarch);
- (c) *Then, that he had not restored* the Shyppes which he had sent him (Appian, pp. 381-2).

3. The Soothsayer to Antony:

- (a) Thy Daemon . . . *is | Noble, Courageous* (*A. & C.*, ii. iii. 19-20);
- (b) thy Demon . . . *is affraide of his: and being coragious & high when he is alone.* . . . (Plutarch);
- (c) *thy nature is noble and coragious* (Appian, p. 371).

4. A stage direction:

- (a) *They heaue* Anthony aloft to Cleopatra. (*A. & C.*, iv. xiii. 37);

- (b) Cleopatra . . . cast out certaine chaines and ropes, in the which Antonius was trussed: and Cleopatra her owne selfe, with two women onely . . . trised Antonius vp . . . they plucked vp poore Antonius all bloudy as he was (Plutarch);
- (c) Cleopatra . . . let downe sheetes & lines to heaue him vp (Appian, p. 392).

Since there can be no 'serious doubt' that Appian was consulted by Shakespeare when he worked on *Antony and Cleopatra*, we must suppose that he glanced at the *Continuation*, even though he used North's Plutarch as his principal source. It is a pity, therefore, that Mr. Schanzer has not reprinted the relevant passages from this section.

Where checked the edition reaches a fair standard of accuracy, though the tiny print of the footnotes occasionally misled Mr. Schanzer, who apparently worked from photostats. Thus on p. 8, l. 1, for '*Pharsalus*' read '*Pharsalia*'; p. 10, l. 8, for 'signifying' read 'signifiyng'; p. 11, l. 2, for 'Crownes of' read 'Crownes or'; p. 73, l. 1, for '*Manius*' read '*Manius*'. In the text too a few errors have crept in: p. 20, l. 22, for 'had' read 'bad'; p. 41, l. 8, for 'of which' read 'of the which'; p. 72, l. 4, for 'that there' read 'that that there'. But these small slips are by no means common in a work which all students of Shakespeare will welcome.

E. A. J. HONIGMANN

**Textual Problems of the First Folio.** By ALICE WALKER. Pp. viii+170. Cambridge: University Press, 1953. 18s. net.

**Othello.** Edited by ALICE WALKER and JOHN DOVER WILSON. Pp. lxx+246 (The New Shakespeare). Cambridge: University Press, 1957. 17s. 6d. net.

It is hardly possible to praise Dr. Walker's work too highly, yet difficult to do justice to it in a review; for textual studies have in recent years received from her and some American scholars such an impetus that even Dr. Greg, himself in some spheres a prime mover, has had to confess that the rate of change is now alarming and that what one ventures to write about the text of Shakespeare may be out of date before it goes to press. A new recension of a text, however, provides a moment in the flux that can be considered as a fixed point, and Professor Dover Wilson's wise and generous invitation to Dr. Walker to contribute the text and notes of the New Cambridge *Othello* provides an opportunity for testing the calculus that Dr. Walker outlined for us in her *Textual Problems of the First Folio*.

It was clear that Thomas Satchell, when he sent his observations on the compositors of the First Folio to *The Times Literary Supplement*, was opening a new chapter in the transmission of the text. The question who would have the patience and stamina to write that chapter naturally suggested itself, and, while Dr. Willoughby and others have made valuable contributions, the honour of completing the chapter must go to Dr. Walker. Doubtless one should say the first chapter, for it now seems certain that there were more compositors at work on the Folio than A and B, the pair whose peculiarities and failings Dr. Walker has investigated with such ingenuity and skill. The announcement by Professor

Hinman of the discovery of a new compositor E in parts of the Tragedies, including the first Act of *Othello*, in the Folio will doubtless be followed by some modification in Dr. Walker's general conclusions.

At the end of the first chapter, however, sufficient has been established beyond doubt to let one say, in the words of Housman, 'by this time it has become apparent what the modern conservative critic really is: a creature moving about in worlds not realised'. The certificate of good faith that Pollard was able to give to Heminge and Condell as general editors of the First Folio was felt in some way to cover the reliability of the scribes and compositors and proof-readers, for Heminge and Condell declared that the reader now had the plays 'absolute in their numbers' as Shakespeare conceived them. The work of the eighteenth-century editors proved how relative this 'absolute' really was; if any credulity about the state of the text still lingers masquerading in our minds as prudence, Dr. Walker has put her hand to the task of eradicating it, and the determination with which she weeds and tidies up the text can very happily be illustrated in her treatment of *Othello*.

The Q text of *Othello* differs from the F in about 1,000 substantive readings. Accepting for the moment Dr. Walker's view that Q represents a transcript of a late acting version of the play, while F takes us back in many places to a good manuscript, we may fairly conclude that the copyists, whether scribes or compositors, felt no obligation to adhere with religious fidelity to the copy before them. It was not that the Elizabethan or Jacobean printer was incapable of faithful reproduction, but this required some special concentration of regard upon the language inspired by the authority of the work in hand or quickened by constant authorial supervision. As New Testament scholars point out to us, two standards of reproduction may exist side by side. While the Old Testament was being reproduced with a zealous strictness, 'the reverence paid to the apostolic writings', in the time of the apostles and their immediate successors, 'was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their text as distinguished from their substance'. To Jaggard's compositors and proof-readers Shakespeare's language had no intrinsic sacredness; after all, *Othello* was merely a play, and what has been called the instinctive feeling for sense was given free play and actually helped to create variants. While, therefore, the Q and F texts of *Othello* enable us to reconstruct what has hitherto been generally regarded as a good approximation to the original, Dr. Walker feels that with a fuller and warier sense of the accidents of transmission a more thorough recension is now possible.

In addition to demonstrating the need to ascertain as far as possible what may be called the compositors' error quotients, Dr. Walker gives further emphasis to the printer's habit of using printed copy whenever possible. Even when it was clear elsewhere that Folio texts were from corrected Quartos, it still seemed possible that *Othello* provided an exception. Dr. Walker, however, is now satisfied that Jaggard used a corrected Q as copy for F, and as a consequence does not hesitate to make forty-six emendations in places where Q and F agree, and to make a further fourteen changes where she regards the F reading as an imperfect attempt to correct Q. The forty-six group includes eight corrections admitted by modern editors; the common errors thus generally recognized seemed few

enough to be attributed to chance; the acceptance of forty-six would make further argument about the relation of Q and F unnecessary.

Of the corrections now admitted to the text about a third form a group that can be offered on metrical grounds, although the editors usually advance some further reason in their favour. In *Othello's* address to the senate at I. iii. 89,

In speaking of myself. Yet by your gracious patience

the editors follow Pope in omitting 'gracious', adding that it seems obsequious and may have been suggested to the compositor by 'grace' in l. 88. This type of line, however, with three feet on either side of a stop is common in *Othello*: we have an example at I. i. 8,

Despise me if I do not. Three great ones of the city

and at v. ii. 98 the editors accept

I think she stirs again. No. What's best to do?

The opening scene provides an excellent sample of the metre of the play as a whole, with its half-lines and 'alexandrines' which cannot be expanded or reduced to the tidy form that eighteenth-century editors hankered after and that the present editors seem at times to favour on very slight pretext. The very first word in the Q calls for a decision. Is 'Tush' one of those 'connective insertions' that we can attribute, as so often in *Bad Quartos*, to the invention of the actor-reporter; or was it struck out of the text with the later half-line by the scribe responsible for the Folio version? If we admit it in the text, as our editors do, we must not be in too great haste to cast out extra-metrical oaths and exclamations. If we read, as we must, at III. iii. 398, 'Death and damnation! O!', or 'O! O! O!' at v. ii. 201, or at v. ii. 284,

O Desdemon! dead Desdemon! dead! O! O!

why should we strain at the O's at iv. ii. 55,

To point his slow unmoving finger at!—O, O!

They are no more extra-metrical than 'Tush' and other features that demand inclusion. Decorum is sometimes suggested as sufficient cover for quite important decisions. At II. iii. 247 Desdemona interrupts the disturbance on the court of guard; using the F and Q we might read,

*Desdemona.* What is the matter, dear?

*Othello.*

All's well now sweeting.

Q omits 'dear' and F 'now'. The editors regard 'dear', if admissible, as a correction of 'now' and read 'dear sweeting'. Their note says: 'The F. reading does not keep decorum. This kind of affectionate familiarity in public is more appropriate to *Othello* than *Desdemona*.' Yet 'now' seems in the circumstances the reassuring and appropriate word; 'dear' is so used elsewhere in public by *Desdemona*, and to attach it to 'sweeting' is to guard a title that was rich before superfluously. Again metre and dignity are felt to exclude *Othello's* oath at v. ii. 73. To say that restraint is the dominant trait in *Othello's* nature needs

qualification; the man who is driven by anguish of soul to strike his wife in public can break through the shame of naming the cause to the sinner only with an oath; the oath is part of the evidence of his restraint, when that is rightly understood. As to the evidence of the metre, that depends on how we choose to arrange the half lines. Here as in other instances it provides no justification or support for the decision.

The most naked exercise of what may be called Dr. Walker's psychological sense is found in her rejection of 'acerbe' in the phrase 'as acerbe as the Colloquintida', where she justifies F's 'bitter as Coloquintida' by saying the commoner word seems more appropriate to Iago. We may fairly ask who hit on 'acerbe'; it is one of a pair (like twiggen:wicker, crants:rites) that an editor need not hesitate over, unless he believes that compositors or scribes could be responsible for such unusual turns as 'crants' and 'acerbe', and so is prepared to attribute to the copyists a facility even more considerable than Dr. Walker herself usually admits. Here as in some other places Dr. Dover Wilson's protest, duly recorded in the notes, seems justified.

The metrical corrections among the forty-six emendations listed on p. 135 are sometimes supported by reasons as unsatisfactory as those just illustrated; there is a further group depending on the rejection of final 's' in such words as 'sorrows', 'gestures' that is very difficult to judge. Allowing, however, the fullest weight to doubts about the number of these and of the subsequent fourteen alterations that should be accepted, enough remains to justify Dr. Walker's claim that there is a bibliographical link between Q and F; and as a special item of this evidence one must note her splendid correction at i. iii. 322, where F and Q read, 'so that if we plant nettles or sow lettuce, set hyssop and weed up time'. Editors, following Pope, put 'thyme'; Dr. Walker's emendation 'tine', meaning tare, is certain, improving the sense and restoring the symmetry, since 'tine' goes with 'nettles' of the passage.<sup>1</sup> Finally, if we accept Mr. Hinman's claim that compositor E set all but a few lines of Act I of *Othello*, this would confirm Dr. Walker's finding, as E was allowed to work, if Mr. Hinman is right, only from printed copy; his youth and inconsequence, perhaps, explaining the absurd 'kisses' at i. iii. 159.

To consult the notes is a pleasure, meanings being expounded with force and common sense. One passage, however, is difficult to follow. Commenting on iv. ii. 109-10, where Dr. Walker reads

How have I been behaved, that he might stick  
The small'st opinion on my least misuse

(F substituting 'least misuse' for Q's 'greatest abuse') she notes: 'The meaning

<sup>1</sup> The assistant editor has shown me that here I err with Dr. Walker. The symmetry of the passage is built on a chiasmus:

plant Nettles, or sowe Lettice: Set Hisope, and weede up Time.

In the first limb folly is followed by wisdom; in the second wisdom by folly. To preserve the symmetry we must read 'thyme'. Further, as it is not a matter of planting herbs and uprooting weeds, but of the freedom of the gardener to plant or uproot at will, the sense also requires 'thyme'.

of the F. is "how enormous my smallest fault must have been that the least significance could be attached to it". But how then about her greater faults? It seems more logical to say with the Q that her behaviour raises the question how even her greatest fault could give rise to the least suspicion of misconduct. I think here Dr. Onions's interpretation of opinion = censure is correct.

As to the nature of the copy: Q is certainly from an acting version but not necessarily from a late acting version as Dr. Walker suggests. A hasty copy—the writing being far from clear—might have been made from it at a late date, hence the late forms; nor can we argue that because Shakespeare must have known who was to sing the song its omission is evidence of a later occasion. Noble pointed out that Shakespeare perhaps had in mind the boy who had made a success of Ophelia's songs, and gave him as Desdemona a song of a similar kind. *Othello* follows *Hamlet*, but in the interval the boy's voice may have broken. The manuscript used by the Folio scribe could have been, if not an autograph manuscript, one that had Shakespeare's handwriting in places. At III. iii. 426 the phrase 'laid his leg o'er my thigh' looks like an addition that throws out the tense of the following verbs in F. Dr. Walker brings the three verbs into line as in Q; but it is hard to understand why the F scribe with the Q before him made the three successive changes unless he was prompted by the manuscript; further, the manuscript lining may have differed from that in Q, as F arranges it differently. The F here seems to me to give an earlier version than that in Q. Again, several of what Dr. Walker justly regards as vulgarizations cannot be due to faulty transmission but to deliberate simplification. At II. i. 65 'Does tire the ingener' becomes 'Does bear all excellency' in the Q, surely because whoever was responsible for the prompt-book felt that this would be more intelligible.

If Dr. Walker's text is a challenge to what has been regarded as conservative practice, Dr. Dover Wilson's Introduction is in places as severe an indictment of much current interpretation. He finds Mr. Eliot's now popular notion that Othello in his last speech is trying to escape from reality by cheering himself up far from acceptable. A footnote, as it were, may be added to Dr. Dover Wilson's analysis, on the history of the notion that seems to appear as from nowhere in Mr. Eliot's essay, the notion that we are seeing in Othello's farewell the most 'terrible exposure of human weakness'. The notion appears in Tolstoy's strange tirade *Shakespeare and the Drama*; among the many misunderstandings in that almost pathological document occurs a similar criticism of Othello's speech. After declaring that Othello's language, 'whatever kind of nigger he may be', is utterly impossible, Tolstoy continues: 'however effective may be his suicide it quite destroys the conception of his firm character.' And later he finds the pathos false and the speech unnatural. Professor Wilson Knight finds 'there is justice in Tolstoy's complaint', and adds such expressions as 'sentimental, luxuriating in emotion'. It is to this notion that Mr. Eliot's phrases have given its currency. In offering his remarks as a new but disturbing judgement on Shakespeare's art Mr. Eliot felt his interpretation might seem to others too fantastic; had he studied Tolstoy's earlier condemnation and seen the fantastic conclusions Tolstoy develops from it, Mr. Eliot would himself have realized its extravagance.

If Dr. Walker has given us an edition of the play that in recension and annotation is a model of what a scholarly text should be, Dr. Dover Wilson has added one of his most interesting prefaces. The New Shakespeare is now happily nearing completion, without however any slackening in interest, for this latest volume carries us into a new sea of scholarly discovery.

P. A.

**King Richard II.** Edited by PETER URE. Pp. lxxxiv+208 (The Arden Shakespeare [new and revised edition]. General editor: UNA ELLIS-FERMOR). London: Methuen, 1956. 18s. net.

What interested me most in Mr. Ure's Introduction to his edition was his conclusion that Q1 was printed not from autograph but from a scribal transcript corrupted by memorial errors. As a text from one of the better quarto printers, *Richard II* is undoubtedly less satisfactory than might have been expected. In connexion with its manifest imperfections, an examination of the Q1 press-corrections would have been helpful. Professor Black's Variorum edition (1955), recording the variants of the hitherto uncollated Petworth copy of Q1, unfortunately appeared too late for Mr. Ure to make use of it, but Daniel's list of the variants in the three other known copies (p. iv of the Griggs facsimile of the Devonshire copy) has a story to tell; and what is undoubtedly wanted in conjunction with Mr. Harold Brooks's forthcoming study of the quarto is a press-work analysis and a rigorous effort to isolate errors introduced in the printing house from those which may have been in the manuscript.

I do not doubt that there is much more wrong with Q1 than recent editions suggest and, if it proves that the manuscript was corrupted by memorial errors, the position is an unhappy one, for whatever the circumstances in which corrections were made in the example of Q3 used for F1, the correction was plainly sporadic—so sporadic, indeed, that it is difficult to believe that this quarto had served as prompt-copy. Consequently, and unfortunately, we have only a casual check on Q1 and, if Mr. Ure's premisses concerning the character of the manuscript are correct, it follows that F1's authority is higher than is now supposed.

In view of his hypothesis, Mr. Ure is, in some ways, less conservative than usual. He accepts, rightly I think, Capell's emendation 'Marshal' (Q.F. 'Lord Marshal') at l. i. 204, where an interpolation disturbs the metre. The problem is not always so simple, but he has the courage of his convictions about the Q1 copy and this is as it should be, because if textual criticism does not serve to locate errors and emend them (wherever possible) it is difficult to see what its purpose is. Though I should not always have taken the same course, this is of no importance, for new ways with Shakespeare's texts have to be tried and they must weather before the restoration of the fabric can be judged.

My main regret is that too little has been done to eliminate the compositor's errors. In spite of Simmes's care over press-corrections, some slipped through: 'tairor' (for 'traitor'), for instance, is common to both formes of A(i) at l. i. 102, and 'gentleman' for 'gentlemen' at l. i. 152. Why not, then, accept Q2's correc-

tion of 'Esteem as foil' to 'Esteem a foil' (i. iii. 266), which is much more idiomatic, and F.'s correction of the riddling 'He is our cousin's cousin' (i. iv. 20) to 'He is our cousin, cousin'? F.'s reading might even have authority behind it. I was surprised too that F.'s supplement to Q.'s defective line at i. iv. 23 was rejected, for this must have had some warrant. The crux, over which there has been such lengthy debate, is simply solved by reading (like the Old Arden edition, Alexander, and Q6) 'Ourself and Bushy, Bagot here and Green', which presupposes no more than a transposition in F. A determined attack on simple errors is a necessary prelude to any assessment of the reliability of the copy.

I sometimes found Mr. Ure's explanatory notes overloaded with discussion (like the note on the above reading). On iii. ii. 153 ('that small model of the barren earth'), *O.E.D.*, *model*, 8 (= module) would have given the sense which he rightly suggests is wanted (i.e. portion, measure) and so have obviated the need to record interpretations which protract the note unduly; for the pie-crust conceit is, at best, a secondary meaning. Similarly, *O.E.D.*, *passage*, 4 (= journey), at i. iii. 272, is better than the generalized 'travel and experiences' since it provides a closer link with the quibbling use of 'journeyman': Bolingbroke's 'enforced pilgrimage'—the journeys ('passages') as an exile to which he is bound (as an apprentice is by indentures)—will not end in joy, as Gaunt supposes, but in subservience (the lot of the journeyman) to grief, because all he has learnt under exile is grief. I should also have been glad to have been spared some of the notes on sources which make no positive contribution to the understanding of the text. Sometimes they are undoubtedly useful—notably Holinshed's account of the murder of Richard (v. v. 106), describing how he snatched a weapon from one of his eight murderers and slew four of them. This plainly suggests, like the metre of this line ('Villain, thy own hand yields thy death's instrument'), that the second 'thy' was interpolated, as Vaughan conjectured. I think it fairly certain that Vaughan was also right in supposing that 'death' in the preceding line was a substitution for 'thou': 'How now! what means death in this rude assault?' is nonsense. In view of the many slippery readings in this text, I should have liked to see more conjectures of this kind recorded in the collation notes. Mr. Ure has some very good notes on a number of readings which are suspect as memorial errors, but there are many more of poor sense which were well within the range of the compositor's perversion. A selection of the more plausible emendations and conjectures of earlier editors would have kept the reader alert to the many corruptions there may be in this text.

I deplore, as always, the preservation of archaisms in a modernized text and cannot see what purpose is served by, for instance, 'employment' for 'employment', 'president' for 'precedent', 'murther' for 'murder', and 'band' for 'bond'. When *O.E.D.* under *band*, 10 says that the word in the sense of 'agreement' is archaic and 'now BOND', why not accept this, instead of confounding the English language by a new tower of Babel and piling Pelion on Ossa by then having to explain the reading in the notes? Mostly, however, I thought Mr. Ure's edition thorough and sensible. Its 180 pages of text and notes (with a further 28 pages of extracts from Shakespeare's sources) against 107 in the Old Arden edition speaks for itself of the increase in the scope and usefulness of the notes. Neither Arden

edition mentions the F. reading at II. ii. 118 ('Barkley Castle'), and slips in Mr. Ure's text which I have noticed are a missing 'h' from 'Willoughby' (II. i. 68 S.D.) and 'when the' for 'when their' at III. iii. 56.

Alice Walker

**Unity in Shakespearean Tragedy: The Interplay of Theme and Character.**

By BRENTS STIRLING. Pp. x+212. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 30s. net.

By 'the interplay of theme and character' in Shakespearean tragedy Mr. Stirling means the reflection of the state of mind of the protagonist both in other characters and in the themes emerging from the play as a whole. This interest in shared or distributed motivation is linked with an interest in the quasi-ritualistic devices by which some of the tragic characters seek to fortify themselves in make-believe: withdrawal into self, and the consequent shattering of a false 'heroic' posture as reality asserts its claims, are for Mr. Stirling principal characteristics of Shakespeare's tragedies. These leading ideas are applied to a number of plays with varied results. A short chapter on *Richard II* brings out the effective economy by which Bolingbroke's opportunist policy is made explicit in terse statements elicited by Richard's contrasting rhetoric. The chapter on *Julius Caesar* shows in some detail how Brutus tries to disguise from himself the nature of the assassination by describing it in terms of ritual, and it is suggested that we are made alert to this self-deception by a critical attitude towards ceremony pervasive in the play as a whole. Three chapters on *Hamlet* deal in turn with the Prince's emotional vacillation, with the theme of the invasion of privacy emphasized by Hamlet's talk about the recorders, and with the ways in which a feigned madness seems to be used to cover a real 'ecstasy': but none of this seems to me to begin to answer the question of what *Hamlet* is about. A short study of *Macbeth* emphasizes the obsessive quality of the evil to which Macbeth yields. The best chapters are those on *Othello* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. *Othello* and *Iago* are linked by an excessive touchiness about 'reputation': in III. iii, 'the Captain, tensed by his regard for good name, assumes the previous pattern of the Ancient: first the surmise, then the play of fancy in which slander is confirmed by yet more vivid slander, and finally the delusion' (p. 122). *Othello's* commitment to *Pride* is then followed by a perverse 'ritual dedication' as 'personalized violence seeks to become impersonal action' (p. 126). Since the 'consecration', the ritual, is in fact nothing more than 'an enshrinement of self', it quickly dissolves, at each appearance, into the 'upsurging violence' that lies behind it. In *Antony and Cleopatra* there is a parallel alternation of heroic claim and ironic deflation, and it is pointed out that the question of heroic stature is in fact debated in the play before it is decided against the protagonists.

Now a good deal of this is interesting, especially in its demonstration of the varied devices of emphasis and reinforcement that Shakespeare had at his command, and Mr. Stirling certainly offers a number of points to remember when next one re-reads the plays. But method and manner alike result in a certain

externality of approach. Of *Hamlet* and *Richard II* Mr. Stirling says, with no appearance of unease,

Had Shakespeare written both *at the same level of style* [my italics] it is doubtful that *Hamlet* would still be the better of the two, for the combining of plot, character, and idea in *Richard II* shows, if anything, greater unity and concentration. (p. 206)

It is surely an odd conception of 'structure' that sees 'style'—the poetic medium—as detachable in this way. I cannot help wondering also how the book would appear to anyone not professionally concerned with teaching and writing about Shakespeare. There is far too much of an annoying shorthand, as though what should have been a merely preliminary analysis of significance had stopped short before reaching the stage of asking questions about its own terminology and its relation to fundamental human concerns:

As the mousetrap scene is approached the recorder theme evolves profusely. (p. 84)

... Ophelia's madness, which sets forth another recorder facet of the antic theme. (p. 105)

The exceptional unity of *Macbeth* is partly based upon four themes—darkness, sleep, raptness, and contradiction—which combine to give the play much of its character. (p. 139)

At this point the messenger's entry with news of Duncan releases the pattern in augmented form. (p. 144)

True, passages like these make—or can be made to yield—sense in their context, and Mr. Stirling does relate his thematic analysis to the question of total meaning, as in his preoccupation with the alienation of the tragic heroes from full contact with reality. It is also true that those of us whose profession makes us talk a lot about Shakespeare are only too liable to develop a professional jargon. But we really should try not to lapse into an idiom that may positively hinder recognition of the importance of Shakespeare in the life of the adult.

L. C. KNIGHTS

**The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Vols. III, IV, and V: Plays and Playwrights.** By GERALD EADES BENTLEY. Vol. III, pp. xii+470; Vol. IV, pp. 471-960; Vol. V, pp. 961-1456. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. £7. 7s. net.

It is fifteen years since the publication of the first two volumes of what we can now properly refer to as Professor Bentley's great work. Those volumes dealt with the men who performed the plays—the first with the theatrical companies into which they were organized, the second with the individual players; and such a beginning gave the appropriate emphasis for a work which aims at placing the plays in their 'theatrical context'. But the plays themselves, even if they are not to be regarded simply as 'literary documents', are after all the thing, and the three new volumes, subtitled 'Plays and Playwrights', bring us therefore to the heart of the subject. If we have had to wait for it longer than we hoped,

that is because the heart itself proves to be larger than was once expected. Its size is a tribute to the size of the author's own.

This work, covering the drama from Shakespeare's death in 1616 to the closing of the theatres in 1642, is intended as a continuation of Chambers's *The Elizabethan Stage*, and it is natural to begin with some comparison. There are several reasons why the section on plays and playwrights has grown to more than three times the bulk of the corresponding one in Chambers. One is that, writing a quarter of a century later, Mr. Bentley has had a much vaster mass of scholarly material to digest. But there are others less inevitable. He is, if that were possible, the more thorough. He is both more inclusive and more repetitious of information, he is less economical in presentation and less austere in style. In all but the last of these he shows his large-hearted determination to assist the reader; in the chattiness of his writing he perhaps indulges himself.

In a work of reference such as this aims at being, inclusiveness is a prime virtue. Every play, extant or not, must be recorded; there must be an entry for every playwright even though none of his plays, nor more of himself than the bare initials, has survived. So we begin with a lost play (which may have been two) of which nothing is known beyond the title and the author's initials. There follows a piece of music, which, because called a masque, has sometimes been mistaken for a drama. The third writer need not have been a dramatist but perhaps only the transcriber of a play. Only the fourth item offers us an indubitable play of indubitable authorship, and then in an unprinted manuscript and in Latin. All this may give the impression of a desert territory in which there are only tiny and uncertain landmarks; but such as they are, a cartographer must note them if his map is to be efficiently used. And in fact the three peaks stand out clearly: by a happy alphabetical accident Fletcher, Massinger, and Shirley dominate in chronological order the respective volumes.

Mr. Bentley is still more inclusive. He marks down many things that do not strictly belong to his territory at all. Thus, although dating the first part of *The Fair Maid of the West* well before 1616, he offers a helpful half-page on it, because Chambers, who believed it later, left it out. Though Robert Baron 'cannot possibly have written any of the plays properly considered in this volume', numerous mistaken attributions justify a brief account. Shakespeare himself, though not usually held to have written plays when dead, gets in for a similar reason. Thomas Barker is listed because he was named by Archer the bookseller as the author of a play that was really by someone else; and he occasions a further entry for Thomas Basker because his name occurs with this misprint. To the purist all this may seem to have small logic; but it has of course something more humane. A work of reference is for those who may want to use it; and if they come to it in ignorance and hope, they are not to find the door shut because a natural mistake has brought them to the wrong department. This is the spirit in which the book has been compiled and it sets for works of reference a new high standard.

It is the desire to make information instantly available that is responsible for all the repetition. On the assumption that users will often look for help on a particular play without wanting to survey a whole *œuvre*, the same authorities

are often listed, or the same facts laid out, first under a playwright and then again under several of his plays. This practice may be carried to excess. In the course of a seven-page article on Mildmay Fane covering seven extant plays, the two authorities, Leech and Harbage, are listed eight and seven times respectively. Oliphant's book on Beaumont and Fletcher is listed over thirty and Forsythe's on Shirley over forty times. But this is a fault on the right side and will trouble only cranks and reviewers, who alone read a dictionary through. And for these there may be compensation in the things they will never again forget: for example, that the absence of a play from the extant records of Herbert's Office-Book, since these are far from complete, affords no evidence of date; or that the inclusion of a title in Warburton's list of manuscript plays is not proof that he ever owned or even saw a manuscript of it. In more doubtful matters, repetition may occasionally be dangerous: a frequent user of the book might come in time to assume that a dramatist would normally have a contract with a particular theatre on the analogy of Brome's much-cited agreement with Salisbury Court, but though there is nothing intrinsically improbable in such a view, evidence is somewhat to seek.

In the mode of presenting information every care has been given to make things easy for the reader. In a work arranged alphabetically by authors one particularly welcomes the author-heading to each page, an obvious convenience for want of which, even in a new edition, Chambers's third volume is infuriating to use. Another gain is to have each dramatist's plays in alphabetical rather than chronological order; for whereas we can mostly manage the alphabet, the date of a play may be the thing we want to find out. Often of course it is not known; so that, with the abandonment of the chronological order, we are spared not only a hunt through the 128 pages of Fletcher to find a particular play but the temptation to regard the tentative as established. The one serious defect in the otherwise serviceable method of the book is the relegation of seventeenth-century editions to a place among miscellaneous theatrical records. That Brome's *The City Wit* was published in 1653 is more important than the fact, given equal prominence, that Anthony à Wood saw it at Oxford in 1661. Though it would be wrong to expect here what is given in Greg's *Bibliography of the English Printed Drama*, still the printed texts are more than records 'bearing on' publication, and a reader might reasonably hope to see at a glance what texts there are. Yet the three seventeenth-century editions of Fletcher's *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* are, typically, buried in a list of twenty-three items. Moreover, by this practice the early quartos are separated from and subordinated to modern editions—which, however, I wish Mr. Bentley had aimed at giving more completely. (Inconsistently, collected editions like the Jonson and the Beaumont-and-Fletcher folios are put along with modern collections.) In this matter I regret that Chambers's example was not followed.

It is also possible to prefer the austerity of Chambers's style. An occasional provocative—and provoked—colloquialism some may find refreshing, as when the evidence for a speculative attribution is dismissed as 'practically nil' or 'plain absurd'. But there are, if only rarely, touches of that misplaced wit which is called facetiousness: Jonson, in his talk about Middleton, was 'apparently

moved by no fellow feeling because of their common bricklaying associations'; the idea that Middleton may have met his wife through his association with the Admiral's Company 'is a pleasant one, though Philip Henslowe would seem better cast as Pandarus than as Cupid'. Few of us, however, will grudge Mr. Bentley that personal note through which his human presence is often felt. We hear with gratitude of a three-day search, even though unsuccessful, for a rumoured prompt-book of Shirley's *The Royal Master*; we allow one who has not just card-indexed but evidently read so many of these plays to feel now and then that 'Caroline playwrights could be just as incompetent as Elizabethans'; and when an elaborate revision theory which he quotes ends with the admission that it is 'nothing more than a personal view', his comment, 'The final sentence impresses me more than the rest', evokes a sympathetic smile.

With a style thus very different from Chambers's Mr. Bentley has a comparable mastery over his vast material. His brief biographies of authors show a gift for making a coherent outline emerge from tangled or fragmentary detail. Illustrations of the trouble he has taken on the very periphery of the dramatic historian's field occur in the lives of poets like Quarles, Ogilby, and Pestell: though not based on original research nor necessarily giving all that is known, they are remarkable for their sure grasp of essential fact. It would have been possible, it is true, to say something more precise than that Quarles suffered 'some sort of persecution' during the Civil War; but the account of Pestell, clearly distinguishing between father and son, goes straight to the crucial problem of what is to be attributed to each. The plays themselves constantly call for this kind of acumen in the handling of controversial matters affecting authorship or date. On such questions these volumes will be regularly consulted and will usually be found both informative and judicious. It is a field in which uncertain evidence often makes conclusions hazardous, and uncertainty has been horribly bedevilled in the past by an abundance of capricious hypotheses, which reputable scholars have too readily taken over. Mr. Bentley has therefore conferred an immense benefit upon scholarship by his robust and discerning scepticism. This is not of course to be confused with a reluctance to decide. He avoids the common fallacy of supposing that impartiality cannot issue in a verdict, and his conscientiousness in summarizing absurd theories does not prevent his stigmatizing them as such. It is a blessing to be told that many of the attributions of plays in the Beaumont-and-Fletcher corpus 'involve a solemnly irresponsible use of evidence'. F. L. Lucas is castigated for 'arrant wilfulness' in apportioning *The Fair Maid of the Inn* among three authors excluding Fletcher, whom Herbert's contemporary licence reliably records as its author. Yet the stern dismissal of untenable theories may admit of a proper reservation. In this very case the possibility, no more, of a revision by Massinger is conceded; a date for *The City Madam* incompatible with the natural implications of Herbert's licence is rejected 'though with some doubt'; and while it is emphasized that the only evidence for the authorship of *Appius and Virginia* is the title-page ascription to Webster, the alleged reminiscences of Heywood are found 'worth noting'. The precise degree of scepticism is often nicely judged: resisting the common assumption that the surviving text of *The Jew of Malta* incorporates

work by Heywood, Mr. Bentley is content with the remark that Heywood's use of similar material in *The Captives* 'does not necessarily indicate his composition of the scenes' in question.

The value of such scepticism is not merely destructive. Indeed the discrediting of one hypothesis may make way for another. And where his survey of the evidence points to them Mr. Bentley does not shirk novel conclusions. Finding it incredible that Fletcher's *The Chances* had to wait for its first performance till after the author's death in 1625, he is led to the more plausible hypothesis of a first performance in 1617 and a revival about 1627. Another Fletcher play provides an excellent example. That *The Elder Brother* did have its first performance after Fletcher's death is clear from the prologue and epilogue; but Mr. Bentley avoids the usual inference that the author left it unfinished. On the contrary, he convincingly argues from a topical allusion that the play was being written early in 1625 and has no difficulty in showing that it could not then, by reason of the plague, have been produced until sometime after Fletcher himself died of the plague in August. He refuses to believe 'that so valuable a commodity as a Fletcher play—and one which was to prove so popular as this one—would have been left unexploited for ten years or so', and hence rejects the usual notion that Massinger completed the play for the recorded performances of the middle sixteen-thirties. So, if the internal evidence for Massinger's hand is to be accepted, then a collaboration between the two authors, along lines known to be customary with them, follows as the natural conclusion. A still more drastic upsetting of an accepted theory concerns Webster's *The Devil's Law-Case*. In the knowledge that Queen Anne's Company, which acted this play, broke up in 1619, Mr. Bentley brushes aside topical allusions which have suggested a later date and comes out boldly for 1610, the date which is assigned to the trial in the action of the play itself. If this view is acceptable, then of course the chronological relationship between *The Devil's Law-Case* and Webster's tragic masterpieces is reversed.

It will be observed from these examples that Mr. Bentley does more than re-appraise familiar evidence. What his corrective arguments often draw upon is an unrivalled knowledge of stage history. He is always alive to the theatrical situation, into which he can sometimes afford new but tantalizing glimpses. He perceptively links together the casts or actor-lists which were printed in various plays by Shirley, Massinger, Ford, and Carlell in 1629, an unusual exchange of prefatory verses among the same group of dramatists, Massinger's defence of the players in *The Roman Actor*, and a malicious attack upon Shirley's *The Grateful Servant*. But even he can penetrate no farther into 'this miniature war of the theatres'. One thing which he can frequently illuminate, and which is of some significance for literary scholars, is the contemporary reputation of particular plays and playwrights. Randolph's celebrity allowed him to be named in one breath with Shakespeare and Jonson. The evidence of Fletcher's popularity confirms one's previous impression; but it is surprising to be told that Massinger had a 'comparative failure in the theatre'. Nor is there any sign that the tragedies of Ford and Middleton attracted great attention, the appeal of *The Changeling* being mainly owing to its sub-plot.

Over all his miscellaneous material Mr. Bentley maintains a high standard of accuracy. Such an error as the intrusive article in '*The Page of Plymouth*'—the play was of course about the murder of a man named Page—is quite exceptional; and the implication on p. 437 that three of Ford's extant plays belonged to the King's Company, when one of the three in fact is lost, is apparently a slip. In matters of opinion minor inconsistencies are not entirely avoided: though on p. 3 Ainsworth is likely to be only the transcriber of a manuscript play, on p. 42 he is probably its author; that two variant titles refer to the same play by Ford is 'not certain' on p. 436 but has become much more so by p. 445. Ford also suffers one of Mr. Bentley's rare omissions: there is no mention of his prose pamphlet, *A Line of Life*, though its dedication, to which H. J. Oliver's recent book has drawn attention, would have helped to confirm the conjecture that Ford had in the early twenties 'been feeling the pinch of poverty'. In the light of recent criticism Mr. Bentley ought not to say without qualification that the title of *The Changeling* derives from the sub-plot. But such nods are small ones in the course of prolonged and exacting vigilance. Nor is it to be expected that in a work on such a scale Mr. Bentley's judgement, much as I admire it, will invariably win assent. I cannot agree with him when he chooses to date *Women Beware Women* right at the end of Middleton's career. He seems to have overlooked an article by Baldwin Maxwell (*P.Q.* (1943), 338 ff.), whose interpretation of the phrase 'to stock a new-found land' as referring to the women who went to Virginia to provide the colonists with posterity seems to me incontestable. This allusion, pointing to a date in or soon after 1621, confirms the natural supposition that the chess scene in the play anticipates rather than develops from *The Game at Chess*. Of less moment, perhaps, is the acceptance of the traditional attribution of *The Bloody Banquet* to Thomas Drue; but 'meagre' as the evidence is, more weight might have been allowed to the identity of the title-page motto with that on the manuscript of *Dick of Devonshire*, which is now believed to be by Davenport. This last play is included among the anonymous, with some approval of A. M. Clark's argument for Heywood, which surprises me, and some scepticism about J. G. McManaway's attribution to Davenport, which does not. The fuller presentation of Davenport's claim in a Malone Society Reprint is among those scholarly items which, published after 1950, Mr. Bentley has had regretfully to ignore. This perhaps is a play about which he now would change his mind. Another might be Daborne's *The Poor Man's Comfort*, for which Kenneth Palmer, in another recent Malone Reprint, can provide more precise limits of date. In the section on Daborne Mr. Bentley may mislead a reader into thinking that A. E. H. Swaen's work in *Anglia* is not an edition of Daborne's two plays; he has himself been misled by Swaen into thinking that the signature 'P. Massam' on the manuscript of the play is that of the scribe, and by Greg into supposing this manuscript of no textual importance. Whether or not the manuscript version derives, as the Malone Reprint suggests it may, from the author's foul papers, it is certainly able to correct some wrong readings in the quarto, and its 500 variant readings would require serious consideration by an editor of the play.

These, however, are things that were not known by Mr. Bentley's closing

date. As the years pass other scholars will no doubt add supplementary information to his work and some of his conclusions will need revision in the light of it. But upon his volumes all future scholarship in the drama of this period will safely build. They are already being gratefully used by many scholars, who look forward to the sixth and final volume, in which he will pass from plays to play-houses and, we are given to hope, tell us about the customs of the stage.

HAROLD JENKINS

**Thèmes et Formes de la Poésie 'Métaphysique'.** By JEAN-JACQUES DENONAIN. Pp. 548 (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres d'Alger). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1956. Fr. 2000.

Professor Denonain's book is always scholarly and intelligent and contains much that is both new and important. Its one serious defect is that it is far too long, and that too much seems to have been sacrificed to a uniformly and rather mechanically systematic presentation of the material. One is almost tempted to say that the author has not completely succeeded in turning a really first-rate thesis into a really first-rate book.

He begins by complaining that nearly all studies of Donne, Herbert, Vaughan, and Traherne (the four poets with whom, together with Crashaw, he is almost exclusively concerned) have been rather studies of those authors as personalities than systematic attempts to analyse their poetry. He also complains that there has been no really thorough attempt, such as Mr. Eliot once desiderated, to say what 'metaphysical' poetry really is, what the poets so described have in common, and how they differ. M. Denonain has boldly set himself to supply these deficiencies—even, perhaps, to write a book that shall end books on 'metaphysical' poetry. First he offers a kind of provisional definition, in which his account of the history of the term 'metaphysical' naturally owes much to the researches of A. H. Nethercot. He notices—and the point, whether or no it be original, was certainly worth making—that since Dryden the term had been acquiring a more and more pejorative sense (pp. 36–38). And there is much in his suggestion (pp. 52–53) that Milton's use of the phrase 'our late fantasticks' was not literary but social, and that the allusion was to young men who affected outrageous fashions in clothes. He concludes, sensibly enough, that, however unsatisfactory the term 'metaphysical' may be, other terms that have been proposed are even more so, and that 'metaphysical' has now become a completely conventional term, evoking without confusion the *kind* of poetry in which these poets excelled.

It is at this point that M. Denonain's procedure becomes somewhat unsatisfactory. He proceeds to examine, in one after another of the five poets he has chosen and then in certain minor poets, first the subjects they write about (*Les Thèmes*), then the way in which they write about them (*Le Traitement des Thèmes*), and then the verse-forms, diction, imagery, &c., in which they write about them (*Les Formes*). It is true that the *what* and the *how*, though ultimately inseparable, are to some extent analytically separable, but it seems to me that a critic should be continually returning to poems as wholes, that, in his discussions,

the intervals between the sometimes necessary separation of form and content should be as brief as possible, and that he should reveal and communicate to his reader a continuous awareness of the essential *'thisness'* of whatever poem he is examining. M. Denonain, by deferring his examination of Donne's *how* until he has finished his examination of Herbert's, Vaughan's, Crashaw's, and Traherne's *what*, is making us wait a great deal too long. Moreover, a great part of his *what* sections consists of mere prose abstracts of poems, abstracts which in themselves are mere nonentities, but upon which he too often comments as though they were entities. It is, I cannot but think, this excessively abstract and systematic treatment that largely explains his extraordinarily unsympathetic and unappreciative attitude towards Herbert; for, although *The Temple* as a whole has been too indiscriminately praised, and most writers on Herbert have failed to insist that, while his best poems are incomparable, a very great number are lacking in any kind of distinction, it is, surely, only a critic who had for too long separated himself from Herbert's *voice* (or his real voice) who could have insisted so often and so emphatically as M. Denonain has done upon Herbert's vagueness, woolliness, egotism, narrowness, and 'desolating banality' (p. 193). Again and again in the course of reading his book I have found myself asking whether there is really any satisfactory mean between a very brief and general statement of a poet's chief subjects and a detailed examination of particular poems. Having said this, I will now dispense myself from a systematic examination of M. Denonain's in many ways admirable book, and will content myself with directing the reader's attention to various matters that seem to me of particular interest.

Perhaps the most important point he has to make (and it seems to me a very good one) is that what really distinguishes these poets is not, as Mr. Eliot and others have said, a 'sensuous apprehension of thought', but rather an 'intellectual apprehension of sense' (pp. 354 ff.). He remarks that, however various they may be, Donne's love-poems are all distinguished by an intense cerebrality, that even in the tenderest there is little pure feeling or pure sensation (pp. 117 ff.), and that the true 'metaphysical' love-poet does not address some direct appeal to his mistress, but puts himself in a paradoxical or complex psychological situation (p. 163), or (as M. Denonain might have perhaps better expressed it) tries to be some or all of the following things: subtle, difficult, paradoxical, original, unconventional, unexpected. It is for this reason that he refuses to regard Marvell's *Coy Mistress* (and, for that matter, most of Marvell's poetry) as truly 'metaphysical', since its subject is simply the ancient theme of *carpe diem* (p. 162). This, indeed, is perhaps as useful a test as any for deciding whether any particular seventeenth-century love-poem may or may not be properly classified as 'metaphysical': can it, or can it not, be regarded as an elaboration of, or variation upon, a classical topic? Certainly, in Sir John Rowe's poem beginning

Deare Love, continue nice and chaste,  
For if you yeeld you doe me wrong,

love, as M. Denonain remarks (p. 176), is complicated and involved in tortuous

subtleties in a thoroughly 'metaphysical' and (he might have added) a thoroughly unclassical manner. And there is much in his contention that Cleveland excels in the grotesque development of the normal or acceptable (one might almost say, the classical) metaphor, as distinct from the 'difficult', unconventional, 'metaphysical' one (p. 403). Even Donne, though, is not always so utterly untraditional as is commonly supposed, and M. Denonain does not notice (p. 169) that the catalogue of 'impossibilities', *ādūvara*, whether in Donne's 'Goe and catch a falling star', or in Marvell's *Coy Mistress*, has an irreproachably classical pedigree. Nevertheless, the distinction between the traditional or classical metaphor and the characteristic 'metaphysical' conceit remains, and on this subject M. Denonain is at his best. He insists that a conceit is not, as Mr. Eliot said, the over-elaboration of a single image or metaphor, and that, while the purpose of a metaphor is to illustrate or ornament, that of a conceit is to excite curiosity, to stir intellectually, to astonish, even to scandalize, and then to compel an amused and admiring acquiescence. The reader's part is to discover, by a real intellectual effort, the fundamental justness of the comparison; and there is thus established a kind of complicity between poet and reader, who is, as it were, initiated into a world closed to the profane and vulgar (p. 380). These last remarks might, perhaps, have been more closely connected with what M. Denonain has to say later in his book (p. 469) about that society of University and Inns of Court men in and for which so much of 'this poetry' was written, and in which he is inclined to find the chief explanation of its search for subtlety of thought and preciosity of expression and its concentration on the intellectual and cerebral rather than on the sentimental. I have placed the words 'this poetry' in inverted commas, because, when all is said and done, I still cannot but feel that the remarks I have been trying to summarize are very much more directly applicable to the secular poetry of Donne, and to various love-poets who wrote more or less in his manner, than to the four religious poets who occupy so great a portion of M. Denonain's book. Certainly it is on Donne's poetry that he is most memorable and most illuminating, and I cannot but wish that he had chosen to write a book on some such subject as 'Donne and Seventeenth-century Love-Poetry', showing how other love-poets both resembled and differed from Donne and paying particular attention to that very interesting subject, the presence or absence of classical topics and classical metaphors. In such a study the *thisness* both of Donne's poetry and of that of other poets, including Marvell, would have more clearly and continuously emerged.

M. Denonain, who is nothing if not polemical, and who finds occasion to attack most contemporary notions and theories about seventeenth-century poetry, will hear nothing of a 'dissociation of sensibility', and insists that every cultivated mind of our time has the freedom of domains at least as various as, and probably more various than, those accessible to the cultivated seventeenth-century mind (p. 476): in other words (though M. Denonain does not actually put it that way) Proust was able to relate at least as many disparate experiences as was Donne. When, though, he immediately proceeds to declare that in Shelley the union of thought and feeling is indivisible, and that, in comparison with his, the sensibility of the 'metaphysical' poets might be called 'dissociated',

he seems to reveal a deep misunderstanding of what Mr. Eliot was at least trying to say.

Both in the body of his book (pp. 126 ff.) and in a special Appendix (pp. 490 ff.) M. Denonain has a long and interesting discussion of Donne's *The Primrose*, in the course of which he considers and refutes other interpretations and advances an original one of his own. I am not sure either that I fully understand his interpretation or that he himself has fully understood (in so far as it is understandable) Donne's meaning. Nevertheless, I am sure that he is right in rejecting Grierson's (which is the generally accepted) interpretation of the first stanza. Donne is *not* surrounded by primroses that all have six or four petals and seeing that he will have to search for one with five: most of them have five, which is the common variety, but a primrose with five petals typifies a 'mere woman', and Donne sees that a mere woman will not do for his 'true Love'. If, though, he rejects a mere woman, he must choose either one who is less or one who is more than a woman:

Both these were monsters; Since there must reside  
Falshood in woman, I could more abide  
She were by art, then Nature falsify'd.

Here is the real crux, and I strongly suspect that Donne is using 'falshood' and 'falsify'd' first in one sense and then in another (with a kind of pun), and that his meaning is no more profound than 'Since women must be false, I had rather have one who falsified her complexion by art than one whose womanliness had been falsified by Nature'. Here, as at the end of *Aire and Angels* and in one or two other passages whose obscurity has baffled the commentators, I am inclined to think that Donne is being, not obscurely profound, but obscurely trivial.

I have noticed a few factual errors. P. 69: Cowley did not die in 1661, but in 1667. P. 90, note 147: many, perhaps most, of Donne's Holy Sonnets were written before 1617. P. 155: in 'Show me, deare Christ, thy spouse' Donne is not, as Miss Helen Gardner has demonstrated, asking which is the true Church. P. 185: surely it has never 'been supposed' that the Williams MS. was the 'little book' sent by Herbert from his death-bed to Nicholas Ferrar? It *has* been supposed (groundlessly: see *Works*, ed. F. E. Hutchinson, pp. lxx-lxxi) that MS. Tanner 307 was the book in question. P. 244, note 19: the page-reference should be 480, not 423. P. 245, note 25: for p. 480 read p. 500. Pp. 415 and 438: nearly all the Donne rhymes and three of the five Crashaw rhymes, here cited as feeble or imperfect, were perfect rhymes at the time when those poets wrote.

J. B. LEISHMAN

**The Metaphysicals and Milton.** By E. M. W. TILLYARD. Pp. viii+88. London: Chatto & Windus, 1956. 10s. 6d. net.

The drastic reappraisal of Donne's verse which has been the great critical revolution of our day has already begun to bring in its train an equally drastic overhaul of old classifications, not least those disposing of the poets of the following age. For the moment the field is open; and the Walker-Ames

(Washington) lectures, which Dr. Tillyard here publishes, are pioneer work in what he himself calls the 'breaking down' of the 'departmentalisation into schools' of seventeenth-century poets. Understandably, he has 'studied to suggest' rather than to affirm, to found his argument in interpretation of the verse itself and not in the premature assessment of the implications for later writing of our new knowledge of sixteenth-century rhetoric. Nevertheless, this approach cannot but give his book a flimsy and tentative air, as of an interim report; and it means that all is staked upon the quality of the readings.

Dr. Tillyard believes 'that the opposition of Metaphysicals to Milton is less than the opposition of the extraordinary temperament of Donne to the temperaments of the other poets of his time or shortly after' (p. 2). This view he develops from a comparison of Donne's 'Since she whom I lov'd' with Milton's 'Methought I saw my late espoused Saint', and seeks to support by analysis of a few representative poems, or bits of poems, by these and other writers. Some precise points of 'opposition' emerge. Donne's, it is concluded, was a unique poetic temperament, in that he commonly had no end in sight but preferred 'to elaborate his journey' by repeated, self-torturing reversals; and he was self-centred, lacking social sense or aim. Whereas Milton had it in common with the rest of the 'Metaphysicals' that he always moved systematically to a foreseen end, was sound on the poet's obligation to society, and did not thrust his personality overmuch into his poetry, but submitted himself to the age in which he lived. Subsidiary findings are that Donne's 'rhetorical' (metrical) innovation, the introduction into the lyric of the 'pressure of the speaking voice', was foreshadowed by Wyatt and others, and that Milton was further like the 'Metaphysicals' in his use of a 'large-scale wit' of surprises and ironies.

If this case fails to persuade, it is because the readings upon which it is erected continually give an impression of arbitrariness. The crucial comparison of the dead wife sonnets is typically—indeed, fatally—vulnerable. Donne is declared to be self-centred, indifferent to a 'large human context', on the ground that his sonnet lacks real husbandly concern, and is eccentric in its use of a dead wife for a private devotional purpose. The one premiss is a matter of opinion, and not all will share Dr. Tillyard's. The other can only be maintained in neglect of the sonnet's ancestry—the stock Neoplatonic interpretation and rehandling of the great theme of Petrarch's poems *In Morte*. It is unfortunate again that the interpretation which gives Dr. Tillyard his notion that Donne was a 'masochistically' inconsequential reasoner should wholly depend upon Miss Gardner's repunctuation of the manuscript text (see my note in *M.L.R.*, li (1956), 406-7). And even after this, the sought-for *non sequitur* is produced only when Donne's wife is made one of the saints referred to in the lines

And dost not only feare least I allow  
My Love to Saints and Angels things divine.

The least one can say of this attribution to an Anglican divine of an egregious piece of Puritan diction is that, like the other indirections, it is quite unnecessary. There is a straightforward reading of the sonnet, though it does not support any of Dr. Tillyard's conclusions.

Dr. Tillyard's arguments are not everywhere so frail, but they rarely seem quite secure. He shows colourably that some pieces in the *Songs and Sonets* do exhibit reluctance to reach conclusions and an absence of public concern. Yet he loses by the fact that chop-logic, sudden reversals, surprise endings, were the witty stock-in-trade of the day, in a manner of writing not notably demanding shows of social responsibility. Free of these determining conditions, Donne appears to have been as concerned to advance steadily to a set end as anybody else, and a model of public concern: witness the *Anniversaries*, and the sermons. If Dr. Tillyard finds support for his charges outside the initial comparison it appears to be by ignoring the circumstances of the earlier writings, and shrugging off, or explaining away, the later—'in his sermons he forced himself against his natural inclinations' (p. 37). An unhappy impression of wilfulness is produced, which incidental discrimination only tends to confirm. Let Donne go back on his statement that his subject is dead, because he recollects that she is now in heaven, and that is the required refusal to commit himself; let Milton, and it is the stock movement of the Christian elegy, or evidence that he practised witty surprises like the 'Metaphysicals'.

The remaining claims do not cut deep. Readings of Herrick, Herbert, and Marvell, while as unpersuasive in detail as the main attempt to isolate Donne, do indicate differences between his and their poetic manner which suggest that technically they had more in common with Milton than with their wit-grubbing predecessors. Otherwise there seems small gain. Milton's contrivance of such ironies as the happy issue of Satan's evil intention, and such 'surprises' as the abrupt appearance in austere contexts of pleasant nature-descriptions or homely similes, would seem to link him with a great many people beside the 'Metaphysicals'. Donne certainly appears to have been anticipated in his 'domestication of the fluctuating rhythms of speech in the English lyric' (p. 60); but the innovation usually credited to him is a more arresting one, here unmentioned, the counterpointing of speech rhythms against formal metre.

Dr. Tillyard usefully draws attention to this field, and whets one's interest in it. His book is too insecurely founded to do more.

A. J. SMITH

**The Life Records of John Milton.** Vol. II, 1639-51, pp. viii+396; Vol. III, 1651-4, pp. viii+470; Vol. IV, pp. viii+482. Edited by J. MILTON FRENCH. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1950, 1954, 1956. \$5.00, \$7.50, \$7.50.

In my review of the first volume of this work (*R.E.S.*, N.S. ii (1951), 179-81) I complained that its bulk might have been so easily and beneficially reduced. With the publication of the second volume, which brought the story to 1651, it looked as though Professor French would at least not have to exceed the bounds of his proposed four volumes; but volumes III and IV, though longer than the others, reach only to the end of 1669, and it will require one or perhaps two more volumes to complete the work. My criticisms of unnecessary and unhelpful matter in the first volume apply equally to the succeeding ones. For instance, in

the second volume a large number of letters attributed to Milton are reproduced which Mr. French himself says are 'almost certainly spurious'; the insertion of one to Louis XIV, describing his Italian journey and especially his visit to Galileo, which occupies eight pages, is justified on the ground that 'it is an interesting fiction'. What are interesting fictions doing in this galley? Again, some ninety lines of *Epitaphium Damonis* are reproduced, with a verse translation, whereas the prose Argument to the poem presents all the biographical information. Since the work can only be intended for scholars it was unnecessary to translate the numerous passages in Latin, at any rate when, as is usually the case, adequate translations already exist. Certainly Mr. French was imprudent to offer his own translations, for he is not a good latinist and too often misconstrues where others have translated correctly; and his English is generally less easy and clear. Other reviewers have given examples of these deficiencies in the translations and I will add only one from the ninety lines of the *Epitaphium Damonis* mentioned above. In a source-book of this kind we should expect a prose translation aiming at literal accuracy; what we are given is an unnecessarily loose and embellished translation in verse, marred by misconstruings:

Et iam bis viridi surgebat culmus arista,  
 Et totidem flavas numerabant horrea messes,  
 Ex quo summa dies tulerat Damona umbras,  
 Nec dum aderat Thyrsis;

('And now twice the stalk had risen with green ear, and as often the barns had received their tale of yellow grain, since his last day bore Damon to the shades, and yet Thyrsis did not come.') Mr. French translates:

Twice had the ears in the wheatfields shot through the green of their sheathing,  
 As many crops of pale gold were the reapers counting as garnered,  
 Since the last day that had taken Damon down from the living,  
 Thyrsis not being by;

'the reapers counting as garnered' and the last half-line both misrepresent the meaning.

These things have to be said, but such faults do not lessen our debt to Mr. French for his incessant toil in collecting and scrutinizing all the available biographical material about Milton, and for adding many items to our knowledge. There are parts of Milton's story, such as the Salmasius affair, that by his method are presented more completely and come to life as never before. It is when he is thus succeeding in his primary purpose that we see plainly the value of his work, and realize that its basic plan of offering the complete records in chronological order makes it a work of permanent usefulness. We carp but we shall consult. Everyone will wish to congratulate him on nearing the end of his immense task.

B. A. WRIGHT

**A Century of English Farce.** By LEO HUGHES. Pp. vi+308. Princeton: University Press; London: Cumberlege, 1956. 35s. net.

This book is described as 'a study of farce and low comedy in the English theatre from the Restoration to the middle of the eighteenth century'. Mr. Hughes begins his study during the interregnum, and carries it forward to approximately 1750, 'by which point farce as a distinct dramatic genre seemed well set upon its course'.

In his first chapter Mr. Hughes is concerned to show that the term 'farce' is variously used during his period, a play being sometimes called farce in one play-bill and comedy in the next, and the term applied to full-length plays as well as to the shorter afterpieces of three acts or less. He also points out that the few formal definitions he has met with are contradictory and inadequate. Having begun by challenging W. J. Lawrence's dictum that 'the labellings given by bygone authors to their work must remain sacrosanct', he decides to confine his study 'to those pieces which would commonly be labelled farce today'.

Starting with the drolls of the interregnum, he goes on to examine the 'structure and devices' of farce. He regards it as 'comic filler', for which the ideal thread on which to string incident is the chase, since this gives opportunity for such devices as violent physical action, tumbling, beating, noise, disguise, and exaggerated characterization.

Short pieces, we learn, are almost non-existent before 1680 and rare until the end of the century, even though the example had been set by the drolls. From 1704 the typical bill had begun to turn into a regular play followed by a usually farcical afterpiece; and farce became so popular as to produce well over half of the 225 afterpieces of the season 1715-16. Ten years later there were only eleven farces against 150 pantomimes. After *The Beggar's Opera*, however, farce recovered its popularity, but was often played with added songs. In spite of shifts in fashion, it was, all in all, the most popular kind of afterpiece. The rivals of farce in the entertainment world, pantomime and burlesque, are discussed at some length.

Mr. Hughes points out that the primary turns of farce are such old theatrical stuff that specific sources cannot well be traced, though the intrigues which they embellish do derive much from early English drama and from French farce, especially from Molière, but only a little from the *commedia dell'arte*. He gives a series of interesting notes on prominent low comedians, including Garrick. He shows that, while a few farces were purely provincial, the London and provincial repertoires were largely the same. The drolls performed at fairs were 'a combination of melodramatic rant, melting love-story—often the "nut-brown maid" sort—hearts-of-oak British patriotism, and rough-and-tumble farce'.

There is a chapter on 'Some Representative Farces', more than a dozen of them, scenes from which are shortly described. In conclusion it is shown that farce was then popular, but had no critical status, unlike today when Chaplin and other farceurs come in for serious critical comment. An interesting observation is that the popularity of sentimental comedy strengthened the position of

farce by forcing the dramatist more and more into using the afterpiece as a refuge for the laughter driven out by sighs and sententious dialogue.

It is not fair to blame a work of art for not doing what its writer did not intend it to do: but we are entitled to demand of a work of scholarship that it shall make effectual use of research. Here Mr. Hughes has fallen short. He has read a lot; his facts are accurate; but he has not got a coherent theme to which the results of his reading can be related. The history of minor and trivial literature can be interesting and indeed fascinating, but we do not love it for itself alone. It is better considered in connexion with movements of popular taste, social changes, events in a wider sphere, or the background which it provides for important writing. (And one may sometimes find gems in such a literary dunghill.) Mr. Hughes does not do any of these things, and his actual references are not of such scope as to send the scholar to him for information. Had he greatly reduced his earlier chapters, considerably expanded his direct treatment of actors, fairs, and the farces themselves, and related his subject to a wider field of circumstance, his scholarship would have been more usefully directed.

In the Bibliography, Garrick's *Essay on Acting* is dated 1704 instead of 1744.  
J. O. BARTLEY

**Satiric Allegory: Mirror of Man.** By ELLEN DOUGLASS LEYBURN. Pp. x+142 (Yale Studies in English 130). New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1956. 24s. net.

Professor Leyburn's book is a study of satiric allegory, based upon the conviction that 'if satires cast in allegorical form are to be considered as works of art, they must be considered as allegories', and that 'in so far as the work is an imaginative whole, the allegory is the satire and the satire is the allegory'. A chapter of definitions is followed by close critical examination, often very illuminating, of particular examples of the genre. The examples chosen are wide-ranging, and one wonders whether the writer has not unduly limited herself by attempting to relate, under one definition, such very varied works, and whether utopias like *Looking Backward* or *News from Nowhere*, or animal stories like *Uncle Remus*, have enough in common with *Hudibras* or *A Tale of a Tub* to cast much light beyond themselves. Again mock-heroic poems like *Mac Flecknoe* introduce a further metaphoric element in epic reference; satiric characters like those in *Absalom and Achitophel* which perform an allegorical function within the narrative are yet, when considered apart from the narrative, indistinguishable from non-allegorical characters like Pope's Atticus; in Swift allegory is often a device for ironic comment, or, as Miss Leyburn says, 'Allegory itself is often a degree of irony'. In fact satiric allegory, unless narrowly defined, merges readily into other forms of indirection, and it is difficult adequately to consider the more complex kinds of satire in terms of their allegory without stretching definitions to a point where they are no longer very useful. For allegory is after all only one kind of satiric indirection, and it is frequently used with, or abandoned for, other kinds according to the satirist's purpose, the idea

he wishes to convey. *Absalom and Achitophel*, as Miss Leyburn convincingly demonstrates, depends for so much of its satiric effect upon the handling of an unbroken allegorical narrative that it can be usefully approached through the consideration of its allegory, for to examine the allegory is to examine the satire. But in other writers the allegory and the satire are not coextensive, for it may suit the satirist's purpose to break into his allegorical scheme, or to use allegory fitfully in a non-allegorical context, or in some other way to abandon allegorical consistency, yet the work may still be an imaginative whole, and in such cases it is often necessary to begin from a consideration of the purpose for which the allegory is being used. It may be satirically desirable to use a vehicle which would seem ill-chosen and arbitrary if the work were being considered primarily as allegory, or an allegorical figure may be made unreal for satiric purpose, as are the Laputians of *Gulliver's Travels*. These beings with one eye turned inwards and one upwards to signify their exclusive devotion to speculation and astronomy are as woodenly unconvincing as the worst of personified abstractions, because we are to laugh at their remoteness from ordinary life; it would be hard to call this good allegory in the sense that the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms* is good allegory, but allegory is none the less being used to good satiric purpose.

It is Swift who, as the author of three major works which use allegory as one of the tools of satire, and as by far the most varied and complex of the writers considered, is at the centre of this book, and here especially, despite the sensitivity of so many particular comments, it seems doubtful whether the case has been proved for approaching all satiric allegories in the way which is so fruitful for *Absalom and Achitophel* or *Animal Farm*. *A Tale of a Tub* gains less than Dryden's poem from being treated as allegory controlled by plot, since the neatly managed allegorical narrative of the three brothers is embedded in the digressive chapters, whose involved ironies, though they can be called allegorical in the general sense of 'saying one thing and intending something else', seem closer to the methods of *A Modest Proposal* or *An Argument against abolishing Christianity* than to allegory proper. In both *Gulliver's Travels* and *A Tale of a Tub* allegory is used as one of several satiric tools, and the handling of allegory depends on the satiric and moral purpose. Meaning is to be reached not so much by an acceptance of what the allegorical narrative seems to be saying (this is, in a sense, Gulliver's mistake), but by seeing how the narrative and the figures within it are manipulated by the mind of the author; it is not the allegory simply, but the manipulation of the allegory, which gives the full satiric meaning. By such means as the satiric treatment of his 'author', or the rapid change from naïve acceptance by Gulliver or the supposed writer of the *Tale* to serious or ironic comment which can only be attributed to the true author, Swift takes pains to make us aware that we have to do not only with a story which has a meaning other than the literal, but with a story which, along with its meaning and its 'author', is being used for a specific moral and satiric purpose by the mind which created them all and with whose intention we must actively co-operate. It is perhaps not so much a failure in the allegorical scheme, as is here suggested, as a failure on the part of generations of readers to recognize Swift's manipulation of allegory in the service of meaning, which has been chiefly

responsible for the long misunderstanding of the *Voyage to the Houyhnhnms*. But Miss Leyburn is well aware of the complexity of Swift's writing, and her discussion of individual satires and satirists is most penetrating and helpful, whatever reservations one may have regarding the general validity of her thesis.

KATHLEEN WILLIAMS

**The Correspondence of Alexander Pope.** Edited by GEORGE SHERBURN. Vol. I, pp. xlii+524; Vol. II, pp. vi+534; Vol. III, pp. vi+520; Vol. IV, pp. vi+526; Vol. V, pp. vi+234. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. £10. 10s. net.

The reputation of Pope received its severest blow from the exposures which accompanied the Elwin-Courthope edition of his letters in the nineteenth century, and it is the more fitting therefore that this new edition of his correspondence should do much to clear the poet from many of the more intemperate charges made against him in the past. It is fitting too that Professor George Sherburn, whose *Early Career of Alexander Pope* did so much to clear the air, should be the one to present the materials in which the poet is most truly revealed as the man he was. No one has served the cause of Pope scholarship better than Mr. Sherburn, and in no other way, perhaps, than by this new edition of the poet's letters could he have crowned, so appropriately and magnificently, all his previous work.

The present edition increases by over one-third the number of letters printed in the Elwin-Courthope edition. Many of the new letters are mere messages of appointment, or notes of thanks, but there is also a large number of a more substantial and important kind, such as those to the Earl and Countess of Burlington and to William Fortescue, Hugh Bethel, Ralph Allen, and William Warburton. Mr. Sherburn departs from the procedure by which Elwin and Courthope grouped the letters according to correspondents. He arranges them chronologically, and this procedure, along with the presence of the new letters, enables us to follow the course of the poet's life far more closely than ever before. The fifth volume of the edition is mainly given over to an alphabetical list of correspondences and to a lengthy index, but it contains also a few letters which turned up too late to be included in their proper sequence.

After reading through this new edition of the letters one needs only to glance again at the moral outrage displayed on every page of Elwin's long account of the procedures by which Pope got his letters into print to appreciate how greatly, in the last seventy-five years, the perspective on Pope and all his works has changed. The most remarkable sign of this is the fact that Mr. Sherburn has not felt it necessary to conduct any real or extended defence of Pope's character. For the most part he simply presents, in his introduction, a bare history of the various editions of the letters in Pope's own time. Compared to that of Elwin the account here is terse and dispassionate, yet this kind of presentation proves to be that which best succeeds in suggesting that Pope's 'manipulation' of his correspondence had little that was reprehensible in it, and that his alterations and omissions were mainly for artistic effect.

Though the light shed by this edition does much to clear away the fog which has so long obscured a proper view of Pope's character, it is also true that some

of his failings are the more pitilessly revealed. His worst traits are exhibited in the deceptions he practised in order to get his letters printed by Curll in the 1730's and, later on, to get his correspondence with Swift published. The ingenuity used against Curll reaches such ludicrous proportions that the whole episode seems little more than a gigantic hoax, and may well cause one to laugh that such a man as Pope might be. The fraud pursued in the printing of the correspondence with Swift, on the other hand, seems much more serious, and here Pope's falsehoods may well cause one to weep.

The great service of the edition, however, is that it reveals Pope's essentially kindly nature as never before. Certainly he was capable of malice towards Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, and of something less than perfect generosity towards Broome, yet the letters constitute a long record of warm and generous actions on behalf of others: vagrants, idiots, unemployed gardeners, the sons of friends, and many others were the recipients of his charity and benevolence. As this edition makes clear, moreover, these acts of kindness were not revealed by Pope in the letters he published himself, and often it is only from the letters of others that we hear of incidents which bespeak his courtesy and strength of affection, his sacrifice of self, and his fortitude in adversity.

As much as these letters help in our understanding of the man behind the poetry, there is yet a sense in which they set up limits to our understanding, or at least force upon us a recognition of the difficulties in the way of ever penetrating to Pope's innermost sensitivities. Pope liked to think of his letters as talk upon paper, or to say that they gave the image of his mind. Written, as so many of them are, in a high-flown moral style, however, they often give a perfected image rather than an actual one. He may be playful, kind, philosophic, or stern, but one feels that he rarely drops his guard. We may put two and two together and arrive at a fair estimate of his virtues and failings, yet we are never directly exposed to what he called the April weather of his mind. Above all other men he seems to have been able to keep his right hand from knowledge of what his left was doing, and to have been possessed of an inventive ingenuity which on occasion—as in the devices he invented to get his letters into print—could ensnare its owner in unsavoury practices. We may recognize these elements in his character, but we shall never know much, apparently, of the conflicts of interest and purpose which must have occurred within his mind and heart. This vacuum at the centre of our knowledge of the man will always invite the kind of speculation about his motives that will do less than justice to the complexity of his character. The letters enable us better to place Pope in the daily round of his business and pleasure, and to formulate fairer notions of his character and conduct; they do not, however, enable us to pluck out the heart of his mystery.

If the edition has a fault it seems to this reader to reside in the marked brevity of the introduction: a bare ten pages is used to set forth the scope and history of the letters. It is true that the subsequent footnotes (and summaries prefixed to each year's correspondence) expand and clarify the record, but a longer and more explicit narrative at the beginning would be useful and is desirable. As it stands, the introduction may well be all that the expert requires, yet one might hope that an edition of Pope's letters would be read by persons outside the

academic boundaries, and that such a reader might be given more of the information he is here directed to find in Griffith's bibliography or in the scholarly journals.

In the face of the achievement which the edition represents, it may seem trivial to comment on some few details, but to do so may also suggest how little there is to criticize. When the letters contain one of Pope's minor pieces of verse one wonders, for example, why the reader is directed to the Elwin-Courthope edition instead of to Vol. VI of the Twickenham Edition. On several occasions a person figuring in the correspondence is not identified on his first appearance but on his second or third (examples are Sir John St. Aubyn and the mysterious Sir Timothy). The use of brackets to distinguish that portion of a letter previously printed by Pope is in at least one instance confused or confusing if one compares the text of the letter in V. 14 with that in III. 456. There are several misprints to be corrected, a mistake in footnote numbers at IV. 441, and a failure to list the source of a letter at IV. 65.

The size of the task undertaken by Mr. Sherburn was enormous, and as it stands the edition was the labour of more than twenty years. There may be cause in time to assign a few of the many undated letters to different positions, but on the whole one feels that the present sequence has been shrewdly determined. One of Pope's fondest hopes was that his correspondence would be as creditable to him as his poetry. If it has in any sense become so, it is because of the time and care and skill devoted to this edition by George Sherburn.

AUBREY WILLIAMS

**The Major Satires of Alexander Pope.** By ROBERT W. ROGERS. Pp. xii+164 (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 40). Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1955. \$3.00.

Since George Sherburn's *Early Career* brought Pope, as it were, to the brink of moralizing his song, the need for a complementary treatment of the writer of the satires has become steadily more pressing. We have come to realize that the more we understand of Pope the less there is to pardon; but whereas an appreciation of the earlier poems is now firmly based on a knowledge of his peculiar gifts and personality, the critical attitude to the later ones has remained, even among the most perceptive scholars, tentative and defensive. What has been lacking is a comprehensive and sympathetic survey of Pope's later achievement in the light of all that is now known of his life and unique poetic qualities. Dr. Rogers's work meets this requirement only half-way. From an expository point of view it is admirable. It presents a mass of material clearly and persuasively, and it avoids the familiar exculpatory tone. But in the process Pope's poetry fares badly.

In attempting the assessment of a poet it is impossible to be fair without taking sides—that is to say, without having been moved by one's subject. Pope is a poet about whom one can be moved in different ways. George Sherburn would seem to have been fascinated chiefly by the vitality of his personality expressed in his writings, Geoffrey Tillotson and Douglas Knight by his artistic sensitivity, Maynard Mack by the depth of his poetic understanding. Any or all of these

may be the 'right' response to Pope's poetry; what really matters is that the response is there, and informs the criticism. In Dr. Rogers's book it is difficult to detect any response of such a kind. This may be partly due to a desire to be impartial, but one cannot help feeling that its main cause is a lack of interest in Pope as a poet. He starts with a large and casual assumption: 'I have assumed without question that Pope is a great poet and that satire can be a form of great poetry.' This is both too much and too little. Surely one should not assume what one ought to be setting out to demonstrate; and as to whether satire can be a form of great poetry, the statement at once begs so many questions that by itself it scarcely means anything. If Dr. Rogers had been prepared to discuss in what the greatness of Pope's later poetry consists, he would not only have engaged the interest of his readers more readily but would have been tackling what is surely the core of the problem presented by Pope's satires. As it is, on the frequent occasions when he feels compelled to offer some assessment of the poetic quality of Pope's work he falls back on the kind of handbook cliché which one had hoped was a thing of the past in the serious criticism of this poet:

This basic pattern [of the *Epistle to Arbuthnot*] is, however, so elaborately embroidered with passages of wry comedy, pathos, contempt, and serious expostulation that the whole represents one of Pope's most ambitious and successful symphonies.

Unfortunately there is a great deal of this mechanical assessment in Dr. Rogers's book. He tells us that Pope 'recognising the bland quality of Young's characters . . . sought to say more interesting things in a more incisive way'. No doubt Pope did get some hints from Young, and the connexion is historically important; but to suggest that his aim in the *Ethic Epistles* is simply to outgo *The Universal Passion* falsifies our idea of his poetic inspiration. Again, we are told that Pope's 'ability to find clever parallels [to Horace] never flags', thus reducing the *Imitations* to the level of industrious ingenuity. As Dr. Johnson noted, Pope's ingenuity in this direction was remarkable; but its roots are to be found in the emotional satisfaction Horace's poetry afforded him, just as the quality of his imagination is to be perceived in the dazzling expansiveness with which he runs division on Horace's terse and often cryptic utterances.

That Dr. Rogers should be content with such glib criticism can be explained, if not excused, by the fact that his real interest lies in the consistency and development of Pope's thought, and the relationship of various poems and groups of poems to each other in this respect. Where such matters are concerned this book will surely be the standard work of reference for some time to come. Much of his material is, of course, present in earlier studies of Pope, especially the 'Twickenham' introductions; but his skill in assembling his own ideas and those of others produces conclusions that are always enlightening and often surprising. For instance, most readers are prepared to accept in a general way that the *Dunciad Variorum* embodies much of Pope's early ethical thinking, but Dr. Rogers, by insisting on the ethical basis of the poem, and relating it to the *Essay on Man*, both vindicates its moral seriousness and sets it in perspective with Pope's other moral poems. The same lucidity and cogency appears when Dr.

Rogers analyses the various events and pressures which led to the writing of this poem. In his account of the provocations to which Pope was subjected he neither stresses nor palliates the element of personal animosity; instead, this element is justly set beside other critical considerations—the relationship of the poem to Pope's earlier prose satires, the persuasions of Pope's friends, the temper of the age, and so on; so that it appears in its true proportions; and, as a result, Pope's motive in writing the poem emerges for what it undoubtedly was—extremely complex, but essentially responsible.

Dr. Rogers's handling of the philosophical content of the *Essay on Man* is no less impressive. It was Pope's view that the *Ethic Epistles* should serve as detailed illustrations of the *Essay*. For most readers today, however, the position is reversed, so that it is the splendid generality of the *Essay* which affords, as it were, a philosophic point of reference for Pope's sometimes oppressive preoccupation with the facts of vice in the other poems. Roughly speaking this is Dr. Rogers's approach. His discussion of the philosophical implications of the *Essay* is full, yet without tendentiousness; and the sections in which he relates these implications to the *Ethic Epistles* and the *Imitations* are perhaps the best in the book. It is unfortunate that when he comes to treat these other poems individually he has to give too much time to Pope's development of the satiric 'character', having already discussed their more interesting aspects elsewhere; but of this one can hardly complain.

In addition to such exegesis Dr. Rogers presents and discusses with admirable fullness the facts and theories relating to the publication of Pope's later work. He quotes copiously and effectively from the *Letters*, and has added useful appendixes on such matters as the publisher's agreement for the *Miscellanies*, Pope's quarrel with Lady Mary, and the missing *Dunciad* manuscripts. The total result is certainly something in the nature of a 'Later Career of Alexander Pope'. It must be admitted that little of Pope's greatness as a poet emerges from Dr. Rogers's pages, but he has presented to us abundantly and compendiously the data without which that greatness cannot be fully appreciated.

NORMAN CALLAN

**The Life of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu.** By ROBERT HALSBAND. Pp. xiv+314. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 30s. net.

Mr. Halsband is already known by his work in this field, yet only the most undaunted optimist could have hoped for the treasure-trove he offers us in this volume. By a thorough investigation of hitherto unpublished manuscript materials, including a number of Lady Mary's own letters, he has been able to solve the mystery of her departure abroad and her twenty years' residence there, besides throwing new light on the better known phases of her characteristic life. Mr. Halsband has ransacked archives, picked up items from the more obscure printed sources, and, moving freely and happily in the period, has produced not only the most complete, but apart from that, in many ways the best life of Lady Mary that has yet appeared. The portrait is presented to us without probings or psychological theorizings; we can interpret things as we will, from

the disappointing runaway match to the later strange adventures here revealed for the first time. But all the while she lives, in her many activities, as a writer, a social commentator and critic, a wit, a social figure, and as a woman who took seriously her family responsibilities.

'In the spring of 1736, when Lady Mary met a young Italian on his first visit to England, she entered on the most sensational friendship of her life, one which has remained virtually unknown.' And though Francesco Algarotti did not wholly reciprocate her affection, it was to live in his company that she went abroad in 1739, not to return till 1762. Her hopes were not realized; Algarotti, more faithful to his friend Lord Hervey than he was to her, preferred St. Petersburg or Potsdam to residence with her in Venice. Lady Mary got some consolation from being here and there lionized, but her wanderings in Italy and at Avignon brought little real satisfaction, though her spirit was indomitable, her interest in life unflagging. Her most amazing adventure within the larger one was her embroilment, touched upon by Horace Walpole, with Count Palazzi, who succeeded in extracting a great deal of money from her, and was reported as holding her a prisoner. Both these very odd affairs are illuminated by Mr. Halsband, who shows us how within this framework she still led an active life, mentally in writing letters, essays, verses, and reading the latest English books; physically in 'improving' properties that she bought or rented, delighting in planning and gardening, even growing tea.

Thus Mr. Halsband successfully weaves in the known with the new, in a carefully documented work in which the notes (thank heaven at the foot of the page) show the thoroughness of his investigations. It is a little tantalizing to get extracts only from the new letters, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Halsband will at no distant date produce an edition of the Montagu-Algarotti correspondence.

BONAMY DOBRÉE

**The Achievement of Samuel Johnson.** By WALTER JACKSON BATE. Pp. xii+248. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955; London: Cumberlege, 1956. 27s. 6d. net.

**Dr. Johnson's Dictionary. Essays in the Biography of a Book.** By JAMES H. SLEDD and GWIN J. KOLB. Pp. viii+256. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1955. 37s. 6d. net.

'The best part of an author will always be found in his writings.' So Hawkins reports Johnson's protest against biographical curiosity as a substitute for literary study—a growing tendency (used as the ironic basis of *Spectator* 1) which from Edward Phillips and Winstanley onwards had produced a long series of *Lives of the Poets*. In 1778 Johnson characteristically turned the booksellers' invitation to add to the series into the occasion for his most extended exercise in literary criticism. It was all a matter of emphasis and seriousness of purpose.

Professor Bate's book (which begins by quoting Sainte-Beuve's injunction that in considering a great writer we should ask what he would think of us and of our approach to him) would on the whole have had Johnson's approval. It is one of the most valuable, and moving, contributions yet made to Johnsonian studies,

since it tackles in pertinacious detail the central question in these studies: the relation of the man—whose 'character . . . nay, his figure and manner are . . . more generally known than those of almost any man', Boswell could already say—to the writings. The life, with its unending struggle against indolence and despair as well as bodily pain, its 'terrors and perplexities', is seen as allegory on which the works are the comments. The 'achievement' was thus double, its two aspects inseparable, a rare wisdom and compassion heroically won. This book has a special topicality at the present juncture in criticism, when there are many signs of a revolt against the rigorous separation of 'the man who suffers and the mind which creates', a recaptured vision of the (in the proper sense) organic relation of 'craft' to 'character', to both *ethos* and *pathos*. Johnson's own century had to make a similar rediscovery after a long reign of critical purism (so later did Sainte-Beuve). He himself, in treating Milton or Pope, characterizes the man before analysing the poems; and in a discussion recounted by Boswell (13 April 1778) is heard something like Buffon's echo of the dictum of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 'The style is the very man'. The vital and sensitive symmetries of his own prose (one might quote the famous sentence on Savage's 'act of complicated virtue' in relieving with his last guinea the woman who had malevolently testified against him) are the best exemplification. W. K. Wimsatt has admirably demonstrated certain aspects of the equation.

Mr. Bate sees Johnson's goal as the mastery of experience, by a fuller awareness which will at once achieve meaning and pattern without oversimplifying the 'amplitude' of living, afford a refuge from mere self, and emerge morally as a firmer courage. Chapters II–IV trace a pilgrimage from the restless 'hunger of the imagination' (Imlac's phrase, at the pyramid), through the mazes of the 'treachery of the human heart' and the stratagems of defence, the intricate circles of fear, pride, envy, hypocrisy, self-deception, to the 'stability of truth' on which alone the mind can repose. One of Mr. Bate's most deeply sympathetic *aperçus* reveals the Preface to Shakespeare, from which the last phrase comes, as a personal no less than a critical 'triumph of sanity', to be read against the dark background of its author's emotional life in the 1760's. Similarly the unjustly neglected works of the 'great decade' 1750–9 are revived as 'a series of majestic prose threnodies', and the *Lives of the Poets* as 'a final chapter in Johnson's tragic exploration of man's destiny'. Mr. Bate's own final chapter (his best) focuses all we have learned of Johnson the moralist in a fresh assessment of Johnson the critic. The preparation enriches for us his whole conception of literary form and artifice and rule, of 'general nature', of the sympathetic imagination, of instruction by pleasing; his ambivalent attitude to poetic justice; his love (with Burke in statecraft) of concrete fact rather than system; his insistence on 'human sentiments in human language'; his appeal to 'the common sense of readers uncorrupted with literary prejudices' (alone among writers on Milton, Johnson sees the crucial importance of the reader's personal involvement in the fable of *Paradise Lost*); his fondness for the key-word *image*, embodying his ideal of experience grasped, condensed, objectified, the 'outgoing fervours' of true sanity.

'The uniqueness of a work often appears in the extent to which it resists summary.' Mr. Bate's remark may justly be applied to his own book. Nevertheless,

his choice of a distributed 'thematic treatment' leaves an uneasiness. Many of Johnson's dicta sound subtly different in the new contexts here devised for them. This might, of course, be urged as a merit in the method; but some sayings reappear in a variety of new contexts. Further, Johnson himself is strangely isolated from *his* context. It is surely relevant to an examination of the terms in which a man met experience to inquire how familiar these terms were to his contemporaries. All the themes, major and minor, here used as categories cry out for illustration, however cursory, from other eighteenth-century writings: the 'theory' of travel, and of the study of history and biography—not to mention romance-reading; laughter and mental clarity; empiricism itself; the psychology, ethics, and aesthetics of sensation and sentiment; imagination and empathy; introspection and guilt (and the long Puritan tradition behind them); preoccupation with death (Drexelius and William Sherlock were on most library shelves). Perhaps this complaint is merely an ungrateful request for a longer book; and the author of *From Classic to Romantic and Criticism: the Major Texts* has already taught us much (incidentally he has here changed his mind about Imlac's words on 'generality'). A useful companion to the present work would be J. H. Harder's *Observations on some Tendencies of Sentiment and Ethics chiefly in Minor Poetry and Essay in the Eighteenth Century* (Amsterdam, 1933).

The well-documented bicentennial essays on the *Dictionary* by Professors Sledd and Kolb (in which some widespread misconceptions are disposed of) cover three topics. First: the lexicographic tradition before and after Johnson is outlined and the derivativeness of his method (though only partly of his execution) is stressed. Illustrative quotations were used in many Greek, Latin, Italian, Portuguese, and French dictionaries of which he owned copies; and so with divided and classified definitions—used also for English in 1749 by Benjamin Martin (who, as here proved, could not have taken the hint from Johnson's *Plan* of 1747). So far from eccentrically latinizing his definitions (as notoriously in *cough*, also *butter*, *drunkenness*, *eclipse*, *thunder*) Johnson frequently took over and simplified those of earlier dictionaries. Though his work virtually held the field until the *O.E.D.*, that is until the superseding of the eighteenth-century lexicographic ideal which it so nearly realized, it appears to have had no effect on vocabulary or usage, though a decisive influence on later dictionaries. There seems still to be room for a study of his comments on the 'social status' of individual words, in relation to (for example) *Rambler* 168. Second: the history of *The Plan of a Dictionary* is traced in minute detail through the manuscript *Short Scheme for compiling a New Dictionary* (April 1746), its revision, amplification, successive annotations by others, printing in two editions (August 1747), and eventual reissue in octavo (February 1755) as advance publicity for the *Dictionary*. Particularly useful is the authentication of Johnson's account in 1777, often doubted, of how Chesterfield had failed him. Chesterfield is now associated with the project by late 1746, though afterwards neglectful. The reissue of the *Plan*, with its dedication to him unchanged, coupled with his half-condescending 'puffs' of the *Dictionary* in *The World* (November–December 1754), created an impression (which Johnson felt bound to dispel in his Letter) that he had been an active patron of the entire project. Third: the first seven editions of the *Dictionary* are

discussed, and the value of the fourth as best (but far from perfectly) representing Johnson's mature views is confirmed. This essay would have been the most rewarding for literary students had the authors been granted access to the extensive 'Sneyd' set of sheets of the first edition (not, apparently, proofs) with Johnson's corrections and '1630 slips' bearing additional quotations. They have had to be content with a facsimile of one page; its evidence suggests that very little of this additional material was ever included in later editions. On the Reynolds corrected copy the article in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxxvii (1955), 446-75 may now be consulted.

J. C. BRYCE

**William Collins: Drafts & Fragments of Verse.** Edited from the manuscripts by J. S. CUNNINGHAM. Pp. xii+50. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 12s. 6d. net.

No more than three poems have come to light since Collins's death to add to the score published during his lifetime. Thomas Warton wrote in his memoir of Collins that his brother possessed 'a few fragments of some other odes, but too loose and imperfect for publication, yet containing traces of high imagery'. It is these manuscripts, or a part of them, so it would seem, that Mr. Cunningham has discovered amongst the Warton papers at Trinity College, Oxford, and has skilfully edited with brief but sufficient notes and introduction. These are the first autograph manuscripts of Collins's poetry to come to light. The poems are ten in number, amounting to some 400 lines of verse; thus, imperfect as many of the lines are, the corpus of Collins's poetical work is increased by this discovery to the extent of one quarter.

The editor reports that 'no precise dates of composition can be given'; but internal evidence permits some conjecture. Thus 'Lines Addressed to James Harris' (6) were occasioned by 'Hermes' Harris's *Three Treatises*, and are therefore unlikely to have been written much before or much after 1744, the date of the book's publication. Poem 10, with its praise of Fairfax's Tasso, was probably written after the publication in 1749 of the new edition, whose editor was addressed by Collins in a verse epistle, advertised for publication in 1750, but not otherwise known. A draft of the 'Ode to Simplicity' must have been written before December 1746, when *Odes on Several Descriptive and Allegoric Subjects* was published. There is even less evidence upon which to date the remaining poems, though it seems probable that a poetical address to Tonson (7) describing the family house at Barn Elms, and a poem which ends with some censure upon the modern stage (8), were written after Collins went to live in London about 1744. Beyond this, all is doubtful, except that the somewhat sophisticated interest in the theory and practice of painting shown in poems 3, 4, and 9 suggests the work of a man in his maturity; perhaps none belongs to a period before 1742, unless it be the poem of unrequited love (2).

The newly discovered poems add little to the range of Collins's published work, though that little is significant. There is nothing that bears any close relationship to the *Persian Eclogues* (1742); and it would seem that he had early

resolved to have nothing more to do with exotic fancies of that kind. But there is also very little which suggests the characteristic manner of the *Odes*. Judging by that volume, Collins's interest lay in discovering fit embodiment for his allegoric abstractions, implying their nature (for example) by the attitudes they strike, by the garb they wear, and by the places they haunt. In the draft of the 'Ode to Simplicity', of which not a single line is carried over into the final version, there is but the faintest anticipation of this practice, and perhaps that is why the draft was discarded. But it is also remarkable that there should be no anticipation of it in any other of the newly discovered poems, and that none of them should show the metrical virtuosity, or even the metrical variety, of the published *Odes*. Only four of these poems are written in stanzas; and apart from the draft 'Ode to Simplicity', where the same measure is employed as in the published *Ode*, nothing is attempted more elaborate than a four-line stanza of alternate three- and four-stressed lines.

The *Odes* are on 'several descriptive' as well as on 'allegoric subjects', and it is in the character of description that these poems most closely resemble the published work. Johnson remarked upon Collins's delight in 'those flights of imagination which pass the bounds of nature'. That delight can be detected in the opening stanza of poem 3:

Ye Genii who in secret state  
Far from the wheaten field  
At some throng'd Citie's antique Gate  
Your unseen sceptres yield;

and later in the same poem, the 'Ode to Evening' is recalled as the poet enjoys his romantic meditative solitude 'on some Heath all wild and bare', and appreciates the evening light

So sober chaste and cool  
As round yon Cliffs it seems to play  
Or skirts yon glimmering Pool.

The prominence of the *Odes* in the all-too-small corpus of Collins's work has led to his other ambitions being overlooked. Though there is nothing in this volume to match the 'Ode, Written in the beginning of the Year 1746' or the 'Ode to Evening', nothing to prompt a revaluation of his poetry, there is enough to remind us of his aspirations not only as a retired and meditative but as a social poet. *Verses Humbly Address'd to Sir Thomas Hanmer. On his Edition of Shakespear's Works* (1743) is the production of a young critic seeking his place in a world of men and books, and that also is the character of 'The Manners, An Ode', probably written at about the same time; but this quality is scarcely to be found in any other published poem, unless it be in passages of the 'Ode to Liberty' and 'An Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands of Scotland'. The critic, and even the satirist, is much more prominent in the present volume. It is a pity that Collins could not bring himself to put the final touches to the well-turned compliments of his verse epistles to Harris and Tonson, to complete the 40-line fragment (8) in which he presents a sketch of our stage history, and the almost equally ambitious satirical dissertation (9) on nature, art, and 'original

composition'. They might not have affected our estimate of his poetry; they are likely to have been in a more traditional manner than the best of his published work; but they would have exhibited a somewhat wider range than he has otherwise displayed. It is good to have them even as they are, and we are grateful to Mr. Cunningham for finding them and publishing them. We should have been even more grateful if he had persuaded the Clarendon Press to reproduce at least one manuscript in photographic form.

JOHN BUTT

**The Poetical Works of Charles Churchill.** Edited by DOUGLAS GRANT. Pp. xxii+588. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 63s. net.

The modern vogue for poetry of statement, in a selection of the language really used by men, may make the time propitious for Churchill's reappearance: it is decidedly important that so Augustan a writer should be properly available. Professor Grant shows almost impeccable editorial qualities throughout his edition which, though less convenient to use than Mr. Laver's in having its annotations at the end instead of in footnotes, breaks new ground most aptly in the illustrations it draws from contemporary sources. *The Rosciad's* annotations, for instance, replace some of Mr. Laver's biographical detail with contemporary comment on the actors' idiosyncrasies, exactly corroborating Churchill's satire and confirming the *Critical Review's* comment that his strictures were 'just, tho' not new, being indeed no more than the echo of the critics in every coffee-house'. Mr. Grant also identifies literary echoes that Mr. Laver overlooked; occasionally, however, these seem accidental, like the resemblance between *The Ghost*, iv. 274 ('And pluck a rose from every thorn') and 1 *Henry VI*, II. iv. 53, or between *The Ghost*, iv. 854 ('chit-chat, Lively, good-humour'd, and all that') and Pope's 'singing, laughing, ogling, and all that'.

Mr. Grant's transcriptions from B.M. Add. MS. 30878 differ slightly from those in E. H. Weatherley's *Correspondence of John Wilkes and Charles Churchill* (New York, 1954); where he varies he is generally right, though he finds illegible (p. 519) a word in the blurred folio 29 which Tooke in 1844 and Weatherley correctly give as 'illiberality'. The copy-text for the poems is the first edition or else the latest expansion; thus the copy-text's misprint in *The Conference*, 384 is reproduced (the third edition's correction being footnoted), and in *The Prophecy of Famine*, 212 there is the doubtful reading (not footnoted) 'Become discretely all things to all men'. 'Discretely' is from the 1763 collected edition, but the separate edition of that year reads 'discreetly' which, though either word would suit, is presumably what Churchill meant. One or two identifications are unconvincing; 'Ligonier' is unmetrical in *The Times*, 578 (where the original L— — indicates, like the metre, a disyllable), and 'Tyrawley' does not fit in *The Times*, 559. Some comment would have been welcome, too, on Laver's suggestion of 'Burrel' or 'Bertie' for *The Times*, 619, or Wilkes's of 'Hervey' at *The Times*, 638. But these small points merely indicate the interest which Mr. Grant's edition arouses; their fewness is a measure of his general excellence. This volume is undoubtedly definitive.

Churchill's poetic reputé will doubtless remain where it was. 'This meteor blazed scarce four years', as Horace Walpole remarked, yet its flash was dazzling. One is bracingly aware of a bold spirit and a man of ideas—'The gen'rous roughness of a nervous line' is always about something urgent. Churchill's technique, too, is better than is often allowed: though *The Rosciad* is often clumsy its forensic assurance soon develops into technical assurance too, in such passages as the attack on Smollett (*The Apology*, 298 ff.), the easy discourse and ready satire of *Night*, the ruthless humour of *The Prophecy of Famine*, and the manly utterance which closes *The Conference*. *The Ghost* confesses to 'halting rhyme, half-verse, half-prose', but the rhyme does not halt, and the measure provides some of the most readable Hudibrastics in the language, more urbane (though less brilliant) than *Hudibras* itself, a happily rambling introduction to the world of the 1760's, paying its appropriate acknowledgements to Sterne.

Yet for all his ability Churchill rarely attains the poetic *je ne sais quoi*. His epigrams smack well; his puns are bold; he is very funny (though not in the *Epistle to Hogarth* or *The Times*); he argues trenchantly. This unpolished rugged verse he chose (like Dryden) as fittest for discourse and nearest prose. He has his master's ample ease, in lines like 'Wrapt in conceit's impenetrable fog' (*Rosciad*, 489), or 'In any set circumference of waist' (ibid., 828), or 'A happy tuneful vacancy of sense' (*Apology*, 345). He has Dryden's alliterative drive, and something of his large comedy in the self-portrait (*Independence*, 147 ff.). But Dryden's interesting texture is beyond him, as much as is Pope's vivid precision. And Johnson, whom he outgoes in zest, has a subtle diction that constitutes a superior poetic strength. Churchill's words are sometimes not far from poetry in their bite—

But from a croud can single out his grace  
And cringe and creep to fools who strut in lace (*Night*, 93-94)—

or in intensity (for instance, in the passages condemning the Roman church, Tyranny, and Mansfield, in the final pages of *The Ghost*). But generally they run to prose force, or verse force, rather than poetic force; they are plain counters for plain meanings. And finally, his poetic personality is inadequate. As in life, one tires of dogmatism, of the perpetual 'Foe to restraint, unpractis'd in deceit', professing his independence and merit, whose conversation is invariably downright, and who has few subjects other than his contemporaries' failings in government, morality, and literature. One is indeed unconvinced of the insight of one who, professing that 'SATIRE is always VIRTUE's friend', made his peculiar idol of John Wilkes.

To say this is to utter a caveat against rating Churchill too high: he is seldom more than an interesting individualist with plenty to say and a strong hand with verse. But it is not to minimize the appreciation one feels for this scholarly volume, which has put the world of letters greatly in Mr. Grant's debt.

A. R. HUMPHREYS

**Lord Byron's Marriage. The Evidence of Asterisks.** By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Pp. xvi+298. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1957. 30s. net.

This book may be regarded as a sequel to Professor Wilson Knight's *Lord Byron: The Christian Virtues*. That work was a notable and timely exposition of Byron's heroic virtues. It contained a promise that, in a subsequent book, the author would deal with the poet's vices, and the present work seems to be a fulfilment of that promise. It is, however, no condemnation of Byron, of whom Mr. Knight remains a most ardent admirer, but a bold and most interesting attempt to solve the enigma of the poet's marriage and separation from his wife, and clear up the mystery which has hung like a dark cloud over his attitude to sex and love. Mr. Knight writes very truly of Byron at the beginning of his book, 'He was, of course, regarded as a political, perhaps a religious threat, but there seems to have been more than that.' Hitherto the commonly accepted explanation, strongly buttressed by the revelations contained in Lord Lovelace's *Astarte*, has been that the dark secret of Byron's life was an incestuous relationship with his half-sister Augusta Leigh, but, according to Mr. Knight's theory, it 'lay somewhere within the area of homosexuality'. There is plenty of evidence for a homosexual streak in Byron, and his attachments to John Edleston and other youths are well known. Mr. Knight makes out a very strong case for supposing (as others, indeed, have suspected) that the beautiful Thyrsa poems actually refer to Edleston. The centre of Mr. Knight's argument, however, is that the real cause of the failure of Byron's marriage and his separation from Lady Byron was not the revelation of incest between him and his half-sister but his homosexual proclivities leading to an abnormal relationship with his wife. Mr. Knight's strongest piece of evidence is one that has hitherto been neglected by Byron's biographers. It is the two poems called *Don Leon* and *Leon to Annabella* which were published in London in 1866, but had probably appeared earlier on the continent. The first of these poems is attributed in the 1866 edition to 'the late Lord Byron' and the second is actually subtitled 'An Epistle from Lord Byron to Lady Byron'. They have been commonly dismissed as impudent forgeries, and the fact that they contain references to events that occurred after Byron's death makes it certain that he did not write them. Mr. Knight shows that the real author was almost certainly the well-known dramatist, wit, and versifier, George Colman the younger, a man with whom Byron was on very intimate terms at the time of his marriage. The *Don Leon* poems are able and powerful pieces of versification and the plea in *Don Leon* for a more humane treatment of homosexual offenders is moving and impressive, but Mr. Knight surely goes much too far when he calls these poems 'in the best sense classic', compares their art with that of Pope, and labels them 'great'. Nevertheless, these critical aberrations in no way detract from the force of his argument. The poems, if not 'great', have the ring of sincerity and truth, and it seems almost certain that Colman, or whoever wrote them, was not only in Byron's confidence, but had read his *Memoirs* which were burnt after his death. The evidence of these poems is strengthened by the curious fact, on which Mr. Knight lays great stress, that Lady Byron was most anxious that the *Memoirs* should be destroyed. One of the great merits of *Lord Byron's Marriage* is the remarkable

candour and fairness with which its author treats the whole affair of the marriage and separation. After showing that Lady Byron was a thoroughly unreliable witness and that she did her best to obtain a confession of incest from Augusta Leigh, he refuses to condemn her. 'It is not my purpose', he writes, 'to argue that Lady Byron was either a bad or a foolish woman. . . . She had been placed in an unusually difficult position, which to some extent impelled, though it scarcely excuses her actions.' Lady Byron herself, as Mr. Knight acutely points out, was 'a woman of bisexual temperament' and he suggests that the marriage should be regarded as an experiment in the union of two people with sexual temperaments of the same kind which might well have succeeded but actually failed. The analysis of Lady Byron's character on pp. 275-7 is remarkable both for its charity and its insight.

In his last chapter called 'Conclusions' Mr. Knight makes a number of remarks and suggestions concerning the bisexual or homosexual temperament and its relation to genius which are sometimes interesting and illuminating and sometimes wayward and fanciful. The attempt to invest the subject with a religious aura by connecting it with the New Testament and the figure of Christ will be distasteful to many readers, and, to the present reviewer, such reflections seem in no way helpful to the main argument of the book. The attribution of a 'New Testament quality' to a well-known stanza of *Childe Harold* (iv. 137) shows a confusion of critical values similar to that found in the passages that assign the quality of 'greatness' to the *Don Leon* poems. Mr. Knight refers to D. H. Lawrence's treatment of the character of Christ in *The Man Who Died* as 'a failure in understanding'. It is strange that he does not mention the passage in Lawrence's 'Study of Thomas Hardy' on bisexuality in art (*Phoenix*, pp. 458-9), which would have been much more apposite in this particular connexion. Lawrence's description of Byron in this passage as 'a man who is female as well as male' and who 'lives according to the female side of his nature' should surely be quoted in the next edition of *Lord Byron's Marriage*. The statement on the last page of Mr. Knight's book that Byron was the first 'really militant anti-militarist in English poetry' must be challenged. The honour here attributed to Byron surely belongs to John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, whose devastating attack on war and militarism in his *Satyr Against Mankind* preceded Byron's equally powerful satire on the same subject in *Don Juan* by about a century and a half.

The importance of this book lies in the fact that it compels the reader to face certain facts that have hitherto been glossed over, and, in spite of certain blemishes, it is a most valuable contribution to the understanding of the mind and genius of one of the greatest English poets.

V. DE S. PINTO

**The Imperial Intellect. A Study of Cardinal Newman's Educational Ideal.** By A. DWIGHT CULLER. Pp. xviii+328. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1955. 40s. net.

The chief specialist interest of this impressive book lies in the mass of unpublished Newman material (in the Oratory at Birmingham) to which it refers, and

from which it quotes, very extensively. These quotations and references, and the Appendix giving a detailed account of the Newman manuscripts, will be of the greatest value to scholars.

Professor Culler points out that Newman's own earliest studies display his overriding concern as an educationalist for not knowledge itself, but the organization of knowledge in a mind and its effect on that mind. At Oriel, of course, this was reinforced through the influence of 'Noetics' like Whateley, Hawkins, and Provost Copleston; but here Newman also developed a sense, alien to them, of the college teacher's task as essentially spiritual and pastoral. This was what made him (1823-4) reject the inclination to become a missionary (the don was a missionary too); what drew him towards newcomers like W. H. Froude, Wilberforce, and Keble; and what made him engage in a losing battle with Hawkins shortly after the latter became Provost in 1828. In fact, Newman in this year reorganized teaching at Oriel so that each tutor taught his men over the whole range of their studies, and took up in relation to them a position of personal friend and spiritual mentor. It was the way of Laudian Oxford, and Mr. Culler notes the parallel with Newman's later line of thought in religious matters. He also unexpectedly adds: 'there is . . . no question that it was not the conception of the future'. Yet (apart from its specifically religious side) Newman's ideal, in its stress on college teaching as essentially personal, comprehensive, and non-specialist, sounds like what is today, over much of the English-speaking world, known as the 'Oxford system'.

This same trend shows in Newman's opposition to removal of University Tests (on the ground that an Oxford education was an essentially religious one), and in his desire to find some way back towards the medieval conception of a college as a place not of lessons and examinations, but dedicated learning. In various ways, these interests show in his house of residence for young graduates in St. Aldate's (1838), in the Littlemore experiment, and in his addresses to, and conduct of, his University at Dublin. Here religion was at the centre, and the tutors were personal mentors to their students; but the professors were left to themselves as distinguished scholars with nothing of the coach about them. The account in this book of those first days in St. Stephen's Green is in some ways less detailed than in, say, F. McGrath's work on the subject; but for all that, seems more rounded and illuminating.

Yet Newman's mind yearned also after the full intricacy and multitudinousness of knowledge. As a student, he had striven desperately after omni-competence. The same kind of intellectual curiosity lay behind his trip to Sicily (with its attendant scruples and misgivings), his intensive forays into mathematics, and—this time on behalf of others—his special attention to medical studies while Rector at Dublin. The same tension was behind the occasional Dickensian outbursts in his otherwise austere style. These two pulls in Newman lay too near his heart to cause him no strain; and Mr. Culler sees them, in fact, as jointly provoking the recurrent crises of ill health which punctuated Newman's earlier life (at his 'conversion' at sixteen, and then in 1820, 1822, 1827, and 1832 in Sicily). In his view, the history of Newman's body, as well as of his mind, may be seen as a succession of engagements with the problem of the One and the Many. He

is here tracing the same rhythmic interaction between Newman's mental and his physical well-being as Sir Geoffrey Faber noticed twenty-five years ago (*Oxford Apostles*, 1933). Neither of these authors, perhaps, has said the last word on the matter.

The closing chapters of *The Imperial Intellect* centre upon Newman's idea of a liberal education, and have much of value to say about the books and documents by which his discussion took its bearings. His views on the liberal cultivation of the mind go back to Isaac Watts; his argument that useless knowledge is useful after all resumes a forty-year-old controversy between Copleston and John Davison of the *Edinburgh* (which lay perennially in wait for Oxford University); his faint and damning praise of 'the gentleman' exploited a then anonymous work which Newman thought was by Lord Chesterfield; his advocacy of non-Christian authors in a Christian education took account of a contemporary attack on the classics by the Abbé Jean-Joseph Gaume. There is, in addition, much very intelligent discussion of the intrinsic merits of Newman's ideal; though this sometimes appears abruptly among the material of scholarly interest, and is not (how could it be?) always convincing. Thus, that humanism 'provides no means for transcending the limits of the natural man' may be a sombre fact about that view of life, but it is not, as Mr. Culler seems on the whole to assume, an 'objection' to it in the only significant sense of evidence against it (nor is it evidence for it). Another deficiency here is that Mr. Culler is less definite than Newman himself about what does really constitute the centre of a body of living knowledge, and whether (which may be the crucial issue for our own time) there must be one such centre and one only. These are not questions to take up here, however; and it is only the unusual and outstanding scholarly book which will raise, let alone solve them.

JOHN HOLLOWAY

**FitzGerald's *Salaman and Absal*.** By A. J. ARBERRY. Pp. viii+206 (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications 2). Cambridge: University Press, 1956. 25s. net.

Professor Arberry has already contributed greatly to our understanding of the relationship between Edward FitzGerald and Omar Khayyam. He now turns to FitzGerald's first translation from the Persian, his rendering of Jami's romance of *Salaman and Absal*. FitzGerald issued his earlier version of this poem in 1856; his later version accompanied the fourth edition of the *Rubāiyāt* in 1879. Mr. Arberry reprints both these versions and adds his own literal translation. In his Introduction he tells, with copious quotation from the FitzGerald papers now in the Cambridge University Library, the story of FitzGerald's study of Persian under the guidance of E. B. Cowell, of his translation of the present poem, and of his revision of his translation. (A considerable period elapsed before FitzGerald undertook this revision. But surely Mr. Arberry is mistaken in saying that he had in the meantime forgotten even the metre of his original. The letter quoted in support of this statement (pp. 33-34) shows only that FitzGerald had forgotten the metre of the *Shahnama*.)

Jami's poem, completed in 1479, deals mainly with a young prince, Salaman, not born of woman, who elopes to a desert island with his beautiful nurse Absal, and by so doing displeases his father. When his father learns where the lovers are and intervenes, Salaman determines to plunge into a fire with Absal; but the king ensures that only the woman is destroyed. The prince is inconsolable until a sage, his father's counsellor, presents him with a worthier object of adoration.

The poem includes much more than merely this story. It opens with prayer, panegyric, and apologia; the flow of its narrative is repeatedly interrupted by illustrative anecdotes; and just before its close Jami provides an allegorical interpretation of his tale, explaining that Salaman represents the rational soul and Absal the body. At no point, to judge by Mr. Arberry's translation, is the work written in such a way as to excite great interest in its plot. Its style is leisurely, ingenious, figurative, and courtly. Mr. Arberry explains that a Persian composition of this kind can be fully appreciated only when it is seen as its poet's contribution to the 'delicately splendid' book which painter, illuminator, calligraphist, and binder have collaborated with him to create (pp. 43-44).

FitzGerald used only an ordinary printed text. It was clear to him that the poem would have to be severely cut if it were to be made acceptable to English readers. His earlier version is about half the length of the original. He has omitted most of the preliminaries, and abbreviated much else—especially the highly sensuous descriptions of his characters' personal beauty and of their love-making.

Encouraged by Cowell, he tried to make the illustrative anecdotes lighter in tone than the rest of the work, casting them in the *Hiawatha* metre instead of the blank verse used elsewhere. He had no authority for this change of metre. Nevertheless, it is possible to welcome it. Distinguished in this way from their setting, the anecdotes, or at least the best of them, give variety to the poem, and, while reinforcing some of its chief positions, do not obscure the main line of its advance.

To Mr. Arberry, this free reshaping of the original implies a patronizing attitude towards Persian poetry (p. 39). But was not FitzGerald equally ready to curtail and to alter when he was translating from the Greek or the Spanish? Moreover, as Mr. Arberry admits, he did aim at the most faithful translation possible of those portions of Jami's poem which he decided to use.

Mr. Arberry says that, under the influence of Cowell, FitzGerald 'tried too well to be faithful' (p. 50); that when he later revised his translation he allowed himself more of the infidelity which had during the interval so contributed to the success of the *Rubáiyát*; but that his infidelity too often gave rise only to conventional 'drawing-room' poeticizing. This is a just account of the relationship between his two versions; and it explains why most readers will prefer the earlier. In the later, FitzGerald further abbreviates the poem. He corrects some errors, clarifies some difficulties, and gets rid of more of the love-making. Regrettably, he dilutes much of the pleasing idiosyncrasy of his earlier rendering. A conveniently compact instance of this is his handling of Jami's statement that the riding-litter which held Salaman and Absal was 'like an almond with two

kernels' (p. 184). FitzGerald first wrote that the lovers were 'Twin Kernels in a single Almond pack' (p. 78). He then weakened this to 'Like sweet twin almonds in a single shell' (p. 119).

Students of FitzGerald, and of the art of translation, will find much valuable material in this study. Had FitzGerald's two versions been printed facing each other, collation would doubtless have been easier. But Mr. Arberry may be excused for sacrificing this advantage to that of presenting Jami's romance, if not in the delicate splendour of a Persian illuminated book, at any rate in an attractive, unscholastic arrangement.

J. D. JUMP

**The Diaries of John Ruskin, 1835-1847.** Selected and edited by JOAN EVANS and JOHN HOWARD WHITEHOUSE. Pp. xii+364. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956. 70s. net.

This is the first of three volumes in which it is proposed to publish Ruskin's diaries. It covers the period of his unrequited affection for Adèle, residence at Oxford, suspected tuberculosis, six earliest adult continental holidays, and composition of the first two volumes of *Modern Painters*. Owing to the death of Mr. Whitehouse the edition is entirely the work of Dr. Evans, who in her recent *Life of Ruskin* merely claimed for the diaries in general terms that 'nowhere else can the spontaneity alike of his own sensibility and of his literary style be more acutely realised'.

Nevertheless, it might have been hoped that they would shed some specific new light on the man or his work. That this is unfortunately not so is partly due to the incompleteness of this publication, partly to the extensive use already made of the diaries both by Ruskin himself, in *Praeterita* (where he calls them 'ill-written and mostly useless leaves') and in *Modern Painters*, and by Cook and Wedderburn in the library edition of his works (hereinafter referred to as CW), and their continuous availability to scholars, and partly to their merely confirming facts already known.

Their incompleteness is of three kinds: for about eight out of these thirteen years Ruskin did not keep a diary; Ruskin himself destroyed some part of his diaries, including apparently the 'book of pain' or separate diary 'for feeling' which he in 1840 announces his intention of opening; and Dr. Evans has not included the juvenile diary for 1830 or the notebook for 1845, has not translated the passages in shorthand, and has omitted some of the sketches and lists—for instance, the remarks about the Doge's Palace on p. 341 and the thistle on p. 356 are unintelligible without the illustrations to which they refer.

All the facts quoted in reviews of this book in the popular press as now for the first time established were already known. That Ruskin's first impressions of Florence were unfavourable he himself tells us in *Praeterita*, quoting the entry in the 1841 diary. His first impressions of the Louvre are quoted in full from the 1844 diary in CW 12. 449, and CW deign to tell us, as Dr. Evans does not, who Rubini was and what 'our' Poussin, which the Louvre *Plaque of Philistines* is 'worth two of', was called. They also quote the very passage illustrating Ruskin's abiding love for the Alps which is hailed by the most distinguished living English

art historian as 'the episode central to an understanding of Ruskin' in a review which claims that 'It is worth following the steps by which he came to write *Modern Painters* and *The Stones of Venice*. We can do so for the first time in these diaries. . . .' CW also printed much of the 1845 notebook which is ignored by Dr. Evans, and a chronological list from which it appears how full their extracts from the diaries are—over a quarter of the entire diary for 1844, for instance. They omitted passages such as the following:

- Nov. 26th. 41. I cannot possibly believe it to be a year since I wrote the opposite page. . . .  
 Nov. 26th. 42. And now I cant believe it to be only two years ago.  
 Dec. 31st. 1848. How much *more* it seems than Eight. . . .

and were quite right to do so. The point that Ruskin's earliest interests were almost exclusively geological does not depend on the 1835 diary, it was made in *Praeterita*. The unoriginality of his architectural taste in the diaries for 1840–1 is a fact of the same order as his initial failure to appreciate the Pre-Raphaelites. The early attraction of Romanism in Newman's *Apologia* (p. 240) was noticed by Sir Kenneth Clark in *The Gothic Revival*.

The only part of the diaries which has not been constantly available to Ruskin scholars is the diary for 1842, which Ruskin sent to America, where it has recently turned up and forms the subject of a paper by Mr. Van Akin Burd in *P.M.L.A.*, lxviii (1953), 755–63. As this diary was also not available to Ruskin himself when he was composing *Praeterita*, Mr. Burd attempts to argue that Ruskin erred in *Praeterita* in attributing the impulse to write *Modern Painters* to a Wordsworthian theory of the shaping power of the imagination, and in saying that he regarded his drawings of an ivy at Norwood and an aspen at Fontainebleau in 1842 as examples of such a power. Mr. Burd argues that the 1842 diary shows him pre-occupied with observing natural forms and oblivious of Wordsworthian theories. To answer this argument fully would be to go beyond the compass of this review, but no reader of *Modern Painters* or *Praeterita* would consider Wordsworth as Ruskin understood him hostile to the observation of natural forms; and in fact Ruskin does not mention Wordsworth in the context in *Praeterita* at all.

The editing is meagre, capricious, and inaccurate. Of persons mentioned Dr. Evans leaves unidentified Musard, Sir James Scarlett, 'Dean and Pollin', 'Childs', Whitbread, Tennant, 'William and his sister', 'Mr. Grey', Waterloo, Windus, Stanley, Denner, and Memmi, whom I traced without great difficulty. Sometimes her identifying footnote is placed not where the person is first mentioned but when the name recurs perhaps a hundred pages later. The point of the reference to Charteris (p. 360) is lost if we do not know the story in CW 35. 196, and the point of the story on p. 79 is lost if we do not know that Kneller painted Radcliffe's portrait. Sir W. James (p. 211) is not Sir William Milbourne James—the 1841 diary refers to his wife, and Sir William was married in 1846—but Sir Walter James, who was married in 1841 and is referred to elsewhere in Ruskiniana as a friend of the Ruskins.

I also traced ten works of art left unidentified by Dr. Evans, and an art historian should be able to trace many more. If we are being asked to 'study Ruskin's

development' (jacket), we must be told where we can find reproductions of the works referred to. Of Ruskin's own drawings Dr. Evans identifies many by reference to a 'Catalogue', but does not tell us this is the catalogue in CW vol. 38, and leaves many unidentified. Is not the view from S. Giovanni (p. 134) cat. no. 1390, mentioned in CW 35. 276? And that at La Cava (p. 161) no. 1469? On p. 144 she offers two alternative identifications and tells us where one is reproduced: the other is CW 1, pl. 17. The sketch at Amalfi (p. 164) is reproduced in CW 35 (not 4), pl. xvi. Cat. no. 65 (p. 214) is reproduced in CW 2, pl. 3, not pl. 2. 'Plate xvii' (p. 221, n. 2) should read 'vol. 35, plate xvii'. The study of the Duccio Madonna (p. 221, n. 4) is cat. no. 610. Reference might have been made either on p. 136 or on p. 168 to the passage in *Modern Painters* describing the view which Ruskin there speaks of sketching. 'Quennell plate' (p. 362) should read 'Quennell plate 5'. Incidentally, p. 356, n. 3, has become transposed with p. 358, n. 2. The mistake in the date of Karslake's birth (which should be 1820) on p. 258 merely repeats the error in CW. The answer to Ruskin's question on p. 329, whether Bernardino Lanini or Raphael is the plagiarist in a painting of St. Paul, must in view of their respective dates of birth be Lanini.

Perhaps the most interesting part of the book is the plates, which are mostly of hitherto unreproduced drawings in the diaries. Four of them, however, merely duplicate plates in CW: two of these are of sketches mentioned in the text—where, however, Dr. Evans refers us to the CW reproduction and not to her own!

C. H. SALTER

**Studier i Modern Språkvetenskap** utgivna av Nyfilologiska Sällskapet i Stockholm (Stockholm Studies in Modern Philology), Vol. XIX. Pp. 216. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1956. Kr. 30.

This volume, in honour of the eightieth birthday of N. Otto Heinertz, contains more articles relevant to German than to English studies. The latter are, however, fairly representative. There are some lexicographical notes, firstly by M. T. Löfvenberg, who establishes the existence of OE. *twicele* as the etymon of *twitchel* and shows that the semantic development in both this and the parallel form *twicene* has been from 'road-junction, fork' to 'narrow lane, alley'. A. Rynell doubts the existence of a separate ME. word *lynde* 'lawn, glade', and would interpret all possible instances of it as 'wood' (i.e. a generalized sense of the word meaning 'linden'). G. Langenfelt contributes some notes on English interjections, and adds to his already published evidence for the survival of prepositional *a* in the type *A Talbot*. For the Early Modern English period, B. Danielsson uses John Colet's pronunciation (as reported by Erasmus and Smith) as evidence for dating the change of ME. *ē* to [i:] before 1500; and R. Tarselius shows that *will* as an auxiliary verb in the writings of Francis Bacon has a greater range of connotation than grammarians have hitherto supposed, especially in phrases like 'you will pardon me' or 'you will observe'.

The largest and most controversial subject discussed is by S. L. Fristedt in 'The Authorship of the Lollard Bible', in which he answers some criticisms of his

book on the subject. Both Fristedt and other scholars find evidence for a 'First Revision' or 'Intermediate Version', but its precise nature is in question. Fristedt proposes two distinct stages in this revision, which then lead on to the final revision ('Later Version'); but the evidence is difficult to evaluate, and all it can really indicate is a very gradual process in which glosses were added to the existing text of different copies of the literal Early Version, and then successively incorporated into the text of later copies. Even a close quantitative analysis might not show conclusively whether we have to reckon with one, two, or more revisions; and there remains the possibility—as H. Hargreaves has pertinently remarked concerning the version in Cambridge University Library MS. Ee. I. 10<sup>1</sup>—that some such attempts at revision may have been independent and, while executed on principles acceptable to the final revisers, not in fact used by them.

A further theory here defended by Dr. Fristedt is that Wyclif's own dialect is to be traced in parts of the intermediate version. His assumption that a consistent use of *thof* 'though' and *-ande* in the present participle denotes a dialect no farther south than the north Midlands is probably justified; the argument against this, that *thofe* is possibly even a London feature, seems to lack foundation, since the unpublished Public Record Office state paper referred to by Morsbach and others (Close Roll, 8 Hen. V, C. 54/270) in fact contains other traces of northern orthography. But Wyclif's helpers at Lutterworth probably came from a wide area in the north Midlands, and the dialect features in question may reasonably be assigned to, say, a Derbyshire Lollard. To insist that they were Wyclif's own, as Dr. Fristedt still does, is quite unwarranted.

M. L. SAMUELS

<sup>1</sup> *Studia Neophilologica*, xxviii (1956), 130 ff.

## SHORT NOTICES

**Lady Meed and the Art of 'Piers Plowman'.** By A. G. MITCHELL. Pp. 28 (Chambers Memorial Lecture). London: Lewis for University College, 1956. 3s. 6d. net.

Professor Mitchell invites us to consider *Piers Plowman* as poetry—to attend to Langland's 'literary art' as well as his 'subtlety of thought'. This is a welcome approach; but we may weaken the case for the 'art' if too much is claimed for its 'coherence' and 'relevance'. To assert that 'every incident, and every piece of dialogue, every clash of personality, is carefully planned and significant' may be to substitute one kind of unhappy systematization for another. And indeed one feels that Mr. Mitchell oversimplifies in his eagerness to vindicate Langland as a 'well-informed thinker . . . who knows exactly what he wants to say'. Thus, it is urged that the lines referring to the war in Normandy are not to be thought of as 'made meaningful only by the identification of contemporary people'. But who ever claimed so much? That the passage is 'meaningful' in all three texts (that is, with and without the contemporary allusions) will readily be conceded. It would be a poor piece of public moralizing that was merely *dependent* upon contemporary allusion. Here, and elsewhere, Mr. Mitchell seems to set up men of straw (as when we are assured that 'Meed and Conscience are not merely expressing opinions at random'). But we must not suppose that he is merely at exercise; he has come into the lists to champion Lady Meed against her detractors. It is, we are told, 'quite wrong to interpret the speeches of Meed as if she were aware of wrongdoing in herself'; she is 'almost morally neutral'. This is surely quixotry. Mr. Mitchell himself notes Meed's 'impudent' behaviour when she dallies in court before the verdict; but his sympathy is given to her as a woman whom Conscience has 'bluntly and insultingly' refused. Langland's Meed surely has her place in a moral poem, in the well-defined tradition of a thorough-paced roguesy which would be frightening were it not revealed as comically ignorant. Mr. Mitchell does not comment upon her blazing anger when Conscience has spoken of the rule of Reason—nor upon her inept citation of Scripture (Conscience's neatly-aimed *omnia probate* may call to our minds another apparent innocent, Avarice, and his slight error in the matter of 'restitucioun'). That Meed has beguiled Mr. Mitchell is no doubt an indication of the vigorous truth of Langland's art. It is also, perhaps, a measure of the distance between the presuppositions on which that art is based and those commonly employed in later fiction.

JOHN LAWLOR

**The Poems of James VI of Scotland.** Edited by JAMES CRAIGIE. Vol. I, pp. civ+334 (Scottish Text Society, 3rd Series 22). Edinburgh: Blackwood for the Society, 1955.

The poetry of King James VI has been known chiefly from incomplete editions or extracts. His productive early period which lay between 1581 and 1591 has claimed most attention, and it is too often overlooked that he continued to write verse fitfully for the greater part of his life. A collected edition like the present, which makes it possible to assess his range and achievement, has been long desirable.

In a comprehensive Introduction the editor recognizes James's importance as a patron of letters, estimates his debt both in poetic practice and in theory to the poets of sixteenth-century France, and discusses his position in the sonnet tradition. When the sixteen sonnets in *The Essayes of a Prentise* appeared in 1584, sonneteering had been established in France for over half a century, but the great age of Elizabethan sonnet writing had not begun. On the evidence available, James may well have been the first to use the rhyme scheme now almost exclusively associated with Spenser and particularly with his *Amoretti* (1594). A pioneering element is observable in James's work as a whole. The *Reulis and Cautelis* embody much that belongs to the age, but James does invent some technical terms of his own.

Of the merits of certain sonnets there can be no question, but the metre of *Lepanto* and a blend of the elementary and the grotesque in its phrasing make it difficult to see how it could ever have been thought of as 'the garland of a souveraine crowne'.

While it is true that James is essentially a Renaissance poet, traces of the older tradition survive. In the *Phoenix*, there is much that recalls

How *David Lyndsay* did complaine of old  
His Papingo, her death and sudden end.

The editor's excellent notes and appendixes show careful investigation of original sources and throw light on many problems while suggesting lines of wider study.

A. F. FALCONER

**Renaissance Poetics and the Problem of Power.** By GORDON WORTH O'BRIEN. Pp. xxvi+128. Chicago: Institute of Elizabethan Studies, 1956. \$3.50.

This little book is a study of Christian Humanism and the Dignity of Man, as they were expressed in philosophic and poetic writing of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; it consists of an introduction, two chapters, and a conclusion. The first chapter, 'The Clear Spirit: the Avatar of Knowledge', discusses the image of the world and of the mind of man as a glass of deity, and the Neoplatonic idea of the Clear Spirit; the second, 'Microcosmos, the Avatar of Power', discusses various notions of deification. The first chapter leads up to a study of Milton; the second to a study of Shakespeare.

The author has applied himself industriously to all those writers whom a student of Hardin Craig, Marjorie Nicholson, and A. O. Lovejoy might be expected to consult; his range is wide, and as an anthology his work is interesting. After several efforts, I have found it hard to collect any other profit. This I think is partly due to bewilderment at the complicated style; as when, on the first page, talking of the 'fusion of the two concepts which gave rise to the two images' of the mirror, or speculum, and the Clear Spirit, Mr. O'Brien observes: 'It would be difficult to contrive a synthesis of images and ideas whose head lay quite so near as this one to the heels of its antipodes.'

The writer in pursuit of an image may, I suppose, legitimately ignore all else in the passage under consideration; yet I find myself full of qualms and queasiness when two such different passages as *Othello*, III. iv. 137-47, and *Measure for Measure*, II. ii. 114-22, are yoked together because 'Desdemona and Isabella are sister pessimists; the puddled spirit like the glassy essence, assures them men are angry apes, not gods' (p. 38). Desdemona does not think Othello an angry ape, Isabella does not think men in any way near enough to gods to warrant the denial; only one is a pessimist, and some would say Isabella is so unfeminine that they have barely a sex in common.

The queasiness becomes stronger and stronger as I read of Milton's prayer to Urania, 'This posture of humility is fugitive and superficial; for of course the prayers are answered as soon as uttered', and as comment on the lines

What in me is dark  
Illumin, what is low raise and support,

'Blindness is no handicap to one equipped to penetrate the Hyaline before God's throne, though before he takes us there, he notes that his defect makes "wisdom at one entrance quite shut out"' (p. 50). Some entrance, not perhaps through the five senses, seems to have been blocked when this tripped off the writer's pen.

It would be possible to forgive errors of taste; it is less easy to forgive the omission of fifteen vital words from the quotation of St. James on p. 19, which, if restored, seem to make the proposed reading difficult. It is true that their omission is indicated by some dots.

When perplexity, queasiness, and disagreement are allowed for, there remains the anthology, which may be studied with interest. This study, however, would have been facilitated by an index.

M. C. BRADBROOK

# SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

## ANGLIA

Band 75, Heft 3, 1957

Zur Bedeutung und Etymologie von *ae. rôf* (H. Schabram), 259-74.

The Spelling of *Sir Launfal* (A. J. Bliss), 275-89.

*Ich im Englischen* (B. Carstensen), 290-316.

Entwicklungsstufen der Wortbildung aus Initialen (F. Wölcken), 317-33.

## DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL

Vol. xix, N.S. No. 1, Dec. 1957

The Baroque Element in *Troilus and Cressida* (H. F. G. Swanston), 14-23.

## ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xxxviii, No. 6, Dec. 1957

'Whose Little Lad Are You?' (E. Dieth), 241-56.

Snake-swords and Boar-helmets (A. T. Hatto), 257-9.

Geoffrey of Monmouth: An English Fragment (R. H. Robbins), 259-62.

A Ripon Fragment of *Mandeville's Travels* (A. C. Cawley), 262-5.

'Butter for Fish' (N. E. Osselton), 266-7.

Vol. xxxix, No. 1, Feb. 1958

*Pearl* 609-11 (F. Th. Visser), 20-23.

## ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. viii, No. 1, Jan. 1958

I. A. Richards's *Practical Criticism* (P. Cruttwell), 1-15.

The Poet in John Gower (P. Fison), 16-26.

*Wuthering Heights*: The Rejection of Heathcliff? (M. Allott), 27-47.

Mr. Lawrence and Mrs. Woolf (R. Dattler), 48-59.

Middleton Murry as Literary Critic (D. Stanford), 60-67.

The English Language as a Medium of Literary Expression (H. Hulme), 68-78.

Critical Forum: 'Catharsis', 113-20.

## ÉTUDES ANGLAISÉS

X<sup>e</sup> Année, No. 4, octobre-décembre 1957

Le Théâtre de James Bridie (G. Marcel), 291-303.

Harley Granville-Barker (A. J. Farmer), 304-9.

Les Débuts de Somerset Maugham au théâtre (J. Dobrinsky), 310-21.

Le Théâtre de J. B. Priestley (G. Nigot), 322-34.

Themes in the Drama of Christopher Fry (O. Mandel), 335-49.

Le Théâtre de Samuel Beckett (J. J. Mayoux), 350-66.

Le Theme de la découverte de soi dans le théâtre de Ronald Duncan (J. Blondel), 367-77.

John Osborne (L. Bonnerot), 378-91.

Le Modernisme au théâtre (E. Poulenard), 392-9.

Le Théâtre américain d'aujourd'hui (L. Villard), 400-9.

Trois pièces récentes d'Eugene O'Neill (S. Flèche-Salgues), 410-20.

La Vogue de Thornton Wilder (C. Arnauv), 421-30.

Tennessee Williams (R. Asselineau), 431-43.

## HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xxi, No. 1, Nov. 1957

Some Sources of *Tiriel* (K. Raine), 1-36.

A Drawing by Blake of the Last Judgment (A. S. Roe), 37-55.

Blake's Introduction to Experience (N. Frye), 57-67.

Traherne and the Infinite (R. L. Colie), 69-82.

## LENGUAS VIVAS

Año 1, No. 2, octubre 1957

Symbols and Meaning in Melville's 'Benito Cereno' (G. A. Cardwell), 4-13.

## MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Vol. lxxii, No. 8, Dec. 1957

Verner's Law in Preterit of Gothic *slepan* (A. M. Sturtevant), 561-3.

Blake on the Nature and Origin of Pagan Gods and Myths (A. J. Kuhn), 563-71.

Vol. lxxiii, No. 1, Jan. 1958

'Wulf and Eadwacer': An Interpretation (J. F. Adams), 1-5.

Chapman's Plagiarism of Poliziano's *Rusticus* (S. K. Heninger, Jr.), 6-8.

Milton's Criticism of Hall's Grammar (E. Sirluck), 8-9.

Satan's Disguises: *Paradise Lost* and *Paradise Regained* (J. I. Cope), 9-11.

Some Heroic Couplets by James Thomson (A. D. McKillop), 12-14.

Transmutation in Crane's Imagery in *The Bridge* (B. Slotte), 15-23.

Early English Translations from Herder's *Volkslieder* (K. S. Guthke), 52-56.

## MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. liii, No. 1, Jan. 1958

George Meredith and the *Westminster Review* (G. S. Haight), 1-16.

- Stow's *Annals and The Famous Historie of Sir Thomas Wyatt* (M. F. Martin), 75-77.  
 Furetière and Wycherley (M. J. O'Regan), 77-81.  
 The Source of Joseph Trapp's *Abra-Mulè* (B. Moran), 81-83.

## MODERN PHILOLOGY

- Vol. lv, No. 2, Nov. 1957*  
 Landor's Letters to Wordsworth and Coleridge (R. H. Super), 73-83.  
 Newly Attributed Contributions of Arnold to *Pall Mall Gazette* (F. Neiman), 84-92.  
 Mark Twain's *Pudd'nhead Wilson and Those Extraordinary Twins*: Chronology and Development (A. P. Wigger), 93-102.

## NEOPHILOLOGUS

- 41ste Jaarg., Afl. 1, januari 1958*  
 Concept of Form and Structure in Twentieth Century Criticism (R. Wellek), 2-11.  
 Three North-west Midland Manuscripts (C. A. Luttrell), 38-50.  
 An Aspect of Style in Icelandic Sagas (A. C. Bouman), 50-67.  
 'Copy' (*Comedy of Errors*, v. i. 62) (H. M. Hulme), 73-74.

## NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

- Vol. lvi, Nr. 3, Sept. 1957*  
*Aldrediana III*: 'sniueð' (A. S. C. Ross), 144-7.  
 Two Notes on Malory's *Morte Darthur* (R. M. Lumiansky), 148-53.  
*Vol. lvi, Nr. 4, Dez. 1957*  
 Graphies Anglo-Normandes (Ö. Södergård), 190-5.  
 J. H. Füssli and Shakespeare (K. S. Guthke), 206-15.

## NOTES AND QUERIES

- Vol. iv, N.S. No. 12, Dec. 1957*  
 The Origin of 'Aye', 507.  
 The Expression 'Not to care for', 508.  
*A Prayer of the Five Joys*, 508.  
 Inns of Court Nomenclature, 508-9.  
 MS. Notes to the *Faerie Queene*, 509-15.  
 A Borrowing from the *Faerie Queene* in *Old Mortality*, 515.  
 A Crux in *The Tempest*, 515-16.  
 Is *Fi Macbeth* a Reconstructed text?, 516-19.  
 'Blurt, Master Constable' and *The Batchelars Banquet*, 519-21.  
 Shakespeare and Catullus, 521-2.  
 Links with Shakespeare (XV), 522-3.  
 The Text of *Paradise Regained*, 523.  
 Milton and the 'late Fantasticks', 523-4.  
 The Vocabulary of John Marston (XIII), 524-6.

- Thomas Middleton vs. King James I, 526-34.  
*Cromwell's Conspiracy* (1660), 534-8.  
 Burke's Study of Philosophy, 538-43.  
 Smollett's Translation of *Don Quixote*, 543-4.  
 Hogarth as Illustrator, 544-5.

*Vol. v, N.S. No. 1, Jan. 1958*

- The Vocabulary of John Marston, 5-6.  
 Simon Forman's *Booke of Plaies* examined, 9-14.  
 Dryden's Reaction to *Paradise Lost*, 14-16.  
 'Berserk', 16-17.  
 Browning's *Soliloquy of the Spanish Cloister*, 17-18.  
 German Echoes of Pope, 18-20.  
 Dr. Johnson, Medievalist, 20-24.  
 Three Goldsmith Attributions, 24-26.  
 Fielding and Coleridge: 'Poetic Faith', 35-36.  
 Mary Wollstonecraft's Reviews, 37-38.  
 Lewis Carroll's Sister: Henrietta Dodgson, 38-39.  
 Four Letters of Cornelius Webbe, 40-41.  
 The Name 'Gulliver', 44.

## PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

- Vol. xxxvi, No. 3, July 1957*  
 English Literature, 1660-1800: A Current Bibliography (Alleman, Kolb, Woods, and Zimansky), 290-416.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

- Vol. lxxii, No. 5, Dec. 1957*  
 The Dragon in *Beowulf* (A. E. DuBois), 819-22.  
 Dryden's Heroic Line (G. Hemphill), 863-79.  
 The Origins of *Gulliver's Travels* (I. Ehrenpreis), 880-99.  
 The Authorship of *The Turkish Spy* (W. H. McBurney), 915-35.  
 The Early Development of Carlyle's Style (F. X. Roellinger, Jr.), 936-51.  
 The Literary Criticism of George Eliot (R. Stang), 952-61.  
 The Zeitgeist of Matthew Arnold (F. Neiman), 977-96.  
 Mark Twain Describes a San Francisco Earthquake (P. J. Carter), 997-1004.  
 Shaw's Contributions to Music Criticism (G. S. Barber), 1005-17.  
 The Disobedient Artist: Joyce and Loyola (J. M. Morse), 1018-35.  
 The Poetic Language of E. E. Cummings (N. Friedman), 1036-59.

## STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

- Vol. liv, No. 4, Oct. 1957*  
 Rhetoric and the Law Student in Sixteenth-Century England (D. S. Bland), 498-508.

The Chief Source of Marston's *Dutch Courtesan* (J. J. O'Connor), 509-15.  
 'Thomas Middleton a Poett' (M. Eccles), 516-36.  
 'Labors of the Learned': Neoclassic Book Reviewing (E. A. Bloom), 537-63.  
 Ezra Pound's Debt to Walt Whitman (C. B. Willard), 573-81.

## TEXAS STUDIES IN ENGLISH

Vol. xxxvi, 1957

Holinshed and Henry VIII (R. A. Law), 3-11.  
 Imagination and the Understanding: Contemporary Versions (W. J. Handy), 20-27.  
 Sir Thomas Elyot Redivivus (D. T. Starnes), 28-40.

The Cambridge *Suite du Merlin* Re-examined (R. H. Wilson), 41-51.  
 Hawthorne and the Vanishing Venus (H. G. Fairbanks), 52-70.  
 The Critical Implications of Howell's Realism (M. Westbrook), 71-79.  
 The Riddle of Melville's *Mardi* (P. Graham), 93-99.  
 Thematic Structure in Keats's *Endymion* (C. Arnett), 100-9.  
*Gerontion* and the Later Poetry of T. S. Eliot (M. W. Williamson), 110-26.  
 Reason, Passion, and Introspection in *Astrophel and Stella* (R. L. Montgomery, Jr.), 127-40.  
 Transcendental Grocery Bills [Thoreau's *Walden*] (J. Jones), 141-54.  
 Frederick Tennyson Letters: An Index (C. Fall), 155-63.

## LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

July—December 1957

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1957 the date of each publication.]

- ADRIAN, A. A. Georgina Hogarth and the Dickens Circle. pp. xvi + 320. 30s.  
 ANDERSON, M. L. (ed.). The James Carmichael Collection of Proverbs in Scots. Edinburgh. pp. viii + 150. 20s.  
 ANNUAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE. Vol. XXIX, 1949, ed. H. Pettit and A. Macdonald, assisted by W. White. pp. xiv + 294. 40s.  
 BALDWIN, T. W. Shakespere's *Love's Labor's Won*. Carbondale, Ill. pp. viii + 42. \$5.00.  
 BARBER, C. L. The Idea of Honour in the English Drama, 1591-1700. Göteborg. pp. 368. Kr. 25.00.  
 BENNETT, J. A. W. The Parlement of Foules. Oxford. pp. x + 218. 30s.  
 BETHURUM, D. The Homilies of Wulfstan. Oxford. pp. xiv + 384. 55s.  
 BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY. Records of the Court of the Stationers' Company, 1602 to 1640, ed. W. A. Jackson. pp. xxiv + 556. £6.  
 BLOOM, E. A. Samuel Johnson in Grub Street. Providence, Rhode Island. pp. xii + 310. \$6.00.  
 BODLEIAN LIBRARY. Guide to 1957 Exhibition of English Literature in the 17th Century. Oxford. pp. 168.  
 BOWYER, T. H. A Bibliographical Examination of the Earliest Editions of the Letters of Junius. Charlottesville, Va. pp. xxxiv + 148.  
 BRAND, C. P. Italy and the English Roman-tics. Cambridge. pp. xii + 286. 35s.  
 BROWN, J. R. Shakespeare and his Comedies. pp. 208. 18s.  
 BUCKLEY, V. Essays in Poetry, mainly Australian. Melbourne; London. pp. x + 198. 30s.  
 BULLOUGH, G. (ed.). Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare. Vol. I, pp. xx + 532. 45s.  
 BURKE, F. Metrical Roughness in Marston's Formal Satire. Washington, D.C. pp. viii + 98. \$1.25.  
 BURKE, K. Counter-Statement. [Reprint.] Chicago; London. pp. xiv + 220. 10s. 6d.  
 BUSH, D. Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition in English Poetry. [Reprint.] New York, London. pp. x + 360. 35s.  
 — Mythology and the Romantic Tradition in English Poetry. [Reprint.] New York; London. pp. xvi + 648. 50s.  
 — The Renaissance and English Humanism. [Reprint.] Toronto; London. pp. 140. 24s.  
 CAMBRIDGE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. Vol. V, Supplement: A.D. 600-1900, ed. G. Watson. pp. xiv + 710. 70s.  
 CARNEGIE INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY. All the King's Men: A Symposium by

- Members of the Department of English .  
Pittsburgh. pp. xiv+90.
- CHAUCER, G. Complete Works, ed. F. N. Robinson. [2nd edn.] pp. xlv+1002. 42s.
- CLEMEN, W. Kommentar zu Shakespeares Richard III. Göttingen. pp. 356.
- CLOUGH, A. H. Correspondence, ed. F. L. Mulhauser. Oxford. Vol. I, pp. xxiv+320; Vol. II, pp. vi+321-656. £5. 5s.
- COLERIDGE, S. T. Notebooks, ed. K. Coburn. Vol. I, 1798-1804; Text, pp. xlii+546, Notes, pp. xli+616. 75s.
- COLLET, G.-P. George Moore et la France. Genève. pp. vi+234. Fr. 15.00.
- CONKLIN, P. S. A History of Hamlet Criticism 1601-1821. pp. x+176. 21s.
- CRANE, R. S. (ed.). Critics and Criticism. [Abridged edn.] Chicago; London. pp. viii+276. 12s. 6d.
- CRINÒ, A. M. John Dryden. Firenze. pp. 406.
- DALZIEL, M. Popular Fiction 100 Years Ago. pp. viii+188. 20s.
- DAVIDSON, E. H. Poe. A Critical Study. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xiv+296. 38s.
- DAVIS, C. T. Dante and the Idea of Rome. Oxford. pp. viii+302. 30s.
- DAVIS, D. B. Homicide in American Fiction, 1798-1860. Ithaca; London. pp. xviii+346. 30s.
- DICKENS, C. Sketches by Boz, introd. T. Holme. pp. xxii+688. American Notes and Pictures from Italy, introd. S. Sitwell. (New Oxford Illustrated Dickens.) pp. xvi+434. 12s. 6d. each.
- DICKEY, F. M. Not Wisely but too Well. Shakespeare's Love Tragedies. San Marino, Cal. pp. x+206. \$5.00.
- DICKINSON, P. (tr.) Aristophanes against War. The Acharnians, The Peace, Lysistrata. pp. xviii+158. 18s.
- DICTIONARY OF THE OLDER SCOTTISH TONGUE. Part XVII, Judge to Knot, ed. A. J. Aitken. pp. 361-480. 50s.
- DIGBY, G. W. Symbol and Image in William Blake. pp. xx+144+24 plates. 35s.
- DRYDEN, J. Concordance to Poetical Works, ed. G. Montgomery, assisted by M. Jackman and H. S. Agoa. Berkeley; London. pp. x+722. 94s.
- DUNN, T. A. Philip Massinger. Edinburgh. pp. xii+286. 30s.
- EARLY ENGLISH MANUSCRIPTS IN FACSIMILE. Vol. VII. Textus Roffensis. (Rochester Cathedral Library MS. A. 3. 5.) Part I, ed. P. Sawyer. Copenhagen; London. pp. xxiv+j<sup>r</sup>-jii<sup>v</sup>+i<sup>r</sup>-118<sup>v</sup>. £26.
- EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. The Bibliotheca Historica of Diodorus Siculus, tr. John Skelton, ed. F. M. Salter and H. L. R. Edwards. Vol. II, pp. liv+397-472. 15s.
- Kyng Alisaunder, ed. G. V. Smithers. Vol. II, pp. viii+218. 37s. 6d.
- Paris and Vienne, tr. W. Caxton, ed. MacE. Leach. pp. xxxii+120. 30s.
- The Phonetic Writings of Robert Robinson, ed. E. J. Dobson. pp. xxii+96. 28s.
- Two Coventry Corpus Christi Plays: 1. The Shearmen and Taylors' Pageant, 2. The Weavers' Pageant, ed. H. Craig. [2nd edn.] pp. xlii+134. 15s.
- ELIOT, T. S. On Poetry and Poets. pp. 262. 21s.
- ENCK, J. J. Jonson and the Comic Truth. Madison, Wis. pp. x+282. \$5.00.
- FAIRCHILD, H. N. Religious Trends in English Poetry. Vol. IV, 1830-1800. New York; London. pp. xii+592. 60s.
- FIRTH, J. R. Papers in Linguistics, 1934-1951. pp. xii+234. 42s.
- FRASER, G. S. Keith Douglas: A Poet of the Second World War. Proc. Brit. Acad. XLII, pp. 89-108. 3s. 6d.
- FRIEDMAN, W. F. and E. S. The Shakespearean Ciphers Examined. pp. xviii+304. 25s.
- FRYE, N. Anatomy of Criticism. Princeton; London. pp. x+384. 48s.
- GARDNER, H. (ed.). The Metaphysical Poets. pp. 328. 5s.
- GLASHEEN, A. A Census of Finnegans Wake. pp. xxx+146. 21s.
- GOMBRICH, E. H. Art and Scholarship. pp. 22. 2s. 6d.
- GOWERS, Sir E. H. W. Fowler. pp. 16. 5s.
- GUNNLAUGS SAGA ORMSTUNGU, ed. P. G. Foote, tr. R. Quirk. Edinburgh. pp. xxxi+89. 18s.
- HARRISON, T. P. Birds in the Poetry of John Clare. Peterborough. pp. 16. 2s. 6d.
- HAUGH, R. H. Joseph Conrad. Discovery in Design. Norman, Okla. pp. x+174. \$3.75.
- HIPPLE, Jr., W. J. The Beautiful, the Sublime, and the Picturesque in 18th-Century British Aesthetic Theory. Carbondale, Ill. pp. vi+390. \$7.00.
- HOUGHTON, W. E. The Victorian Frame of Mind 1830-1870. New Haven; London. pp. xviii+468. 48s.
- ILLSLEY, W. A. Shakespeare Manual for Schools. pp. 96. 5s.
- JACQUOT, J. (ed.). Les Fêtes de la Renaissance. Paris, 1956. pp. 492. Fr. 3,000.

- JONES, G. *The First Forty Years. Some Notes on Anglo-Welsh Literature.* (W. D. Thomas Memorial Lecture.) Cardiff. pp. 28. 2s. 6d.
- JONES, H. M. *The Frontier in American Fiction.* Jerusalem; London. pp. 96. 6s.
- KER, N. R. *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon.* Oxford. pp. lxiv+568+8 plates. £5. 5s.
- KNOX, G. *Critical Moments: Kenneth Burke's Categories and Critiques.* Seattle. pp. xxiv+132. \$3.50.
- LEVIN, H. *Contexts of Criticism.* Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xiv+294. 30s.
- LEVY, L. B. *Versions of Melodrama. A Study of the Fiction and Drama of Henry James, 1865-1897.* Berkeley; London. pp. x+130. \$2.50.
- LO SCHIAVO, R. *La Poesia di Dante Gabriele Rossetti.* Roma. pp. 106. L. 1,300.
- LUCAS, F. L. *Tragedy. Serious Drama in Relation to Aristotle's Poetics.* [Revd. edn.] pp. 188. 10s. 6d.
- LÜDEKE, H. *Anthology of American Verse.* Bern. pp. 124. Fr. 5.80.
- McGRATH, P. (ed.). *The Marchants Avizo, by [John] B[rown], Marchant, 1589.* Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xxviii+64. 8s. 6d.
- MALIN, I. *William Faulkner.* Stanford; London. pp. x+100. 21s.
- MALONE SOCIETY. *The Life and Death of Jack Straw, 1594.* pp. x+48.
- *Damon and Pythias.* pp. xiv+64.
- MEYER, K. R. *Zur erlebten Rede im englischen Roman des 20. Jahrhunderts.* Bern. pp. x+106. Fr. 8.00.
- MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Parts A.4, B.1. Ann Arbor; London. pp. 381-636. 21s. each.
- MILES, J. *Eras and Modes in English Poetry.* Berkeley; London. pp. xii+234. 30s.
- MILLER, Jr., J. E. *A Critical Guide to Leaves of Grass.* Chicago; London. pp. xii+268. 45s.
- MILTON, J. *Complete Poems and Major Prose,* ed. M. Y. Hughes. New York. pp. xx+1600. \$6.75.
- MOSER, T. *Joseph Conrad. Achievement and Decline.* Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. xii+228. 25s.
- MUSCATINE, C. *Chaucer and the French Tradition.* Berkeley; London. pp. x+282. 30s.
- MUSGROVE, S. *Shakespeare and Jonson.* Auckland. pp. 56.
- NICHOLSON, M. *Dictionary of American-English Usage.* pp. xii+672. 30s.
- NIEVO, I. *The Castle of Fratta,* tr. L. E. Edwards. pp. xvi+590. 21s.
- NOON, W. T. *Joyce and Aquinas.* New Haven; London. pp. xiv+168. 30s.
- NOTTINGHAM MEDIAEVAL STUDIES, Vol. I Nottingham. pp. 90. 15s.
- OJALA, A. *Aestheticism and Oscar Wilde. Part II, Literary Style.* Helsinki, 1955. pp. 270. Mk. 1,000.
- OXFORD BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY. *William Blackstone and the Reform of the Oxford University Press in the 18th Century,* by I. G. Philip. pp. viii+130.
- PIPER, H. W. *Nature and the Supernatural in 'The Ancient Mariner'.* Armidale, N.S.W. pp. ii+30.
- PROCTOR, M. R. *The English University Novel.* Berkeley; London. pp. xii+228. 34s.
- RALEIGH, J. H. *Matthew Arnold and American Culture.* Berkeley. pp. xii+302. \$4.50.
- READ, H. *The Tenth Muse. Essays in Criticism.* pp. xii+332. 25s.
- RIBNER, I. *The English History Play in the Age of Shakespeare.* Princeton; London. pp. xii+354. 40s.
- SCHICK, P. *Deutsch-Englische Übersetzungsbüchchen.* München. pp. viii+104. DM. 3.80.
- SCHNEIDER, Jr., B. R. *Wordsworth's Cambridge Education.* Cambridge. pp. xii+298. 32s. 6d.
- SCHUTTE, W. M. *Joyce and Shakespeare.* New Haven; London. pp. xiv+198. 32s.
- SCRIPTA HIEROSOLYMITANA. *Publications of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.* Vol. II. *Studies in Medieval and Modern Thought and Literature,* ed. R. Koebner. Jerusalem, 1955; London. pp. vi+232. 20s.
- SEZNEC, J. *Essais sur Diderot et l'Antiquité.* Oxford. pp. xvi+152+40 plates. 21s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *As You Like It,* ed. Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. D. Wilson (Cambridge Pocket Shakespeare). pp. iv+102. 5s.
- *The Life of Timon of Athens,* ed. J. C. Maxwell (The New Shakespeare). Cambridge. pp. lvi+190. 18s.
- *Love's Labour's Lost 1598.* Shakespeare Quarto Facsimile 10, ed. Sir W. Greg. Oxford. pp. viii+76 plates. 25s.
- *Troilus and Cressida,* ed. A. Walker (The New Shakespeare). Cambridge. pp. lxx+254. 18s.
- SHANLEY, J. L. *The Making of Walden.*

- With the Text of the First Version. Chicago; London. pp. viii+208. 37s. 6d.
- SHERBO, A. English Sentimental Drama. East Lansing, Mich. pp. x+182. \$4.50.
- SMITH, A. H. Place-Names and the Anglo-Saxon Settlement. Proc. Brit. Acad. XLII, pp. 67-88. 3s. 6d.
- SMITH, S. Selected Writings, ed. W. H. Auden. pp. xx+396. 30s.
- SOUTHERN, R. The Medieval Theatre in the Round. pp. xviii+240. 45s.
- SPEIRS, J. Medieval English Poetry. The Non-Chaucerian Tradition. pp. 406. 42s.
- STAMM, R. Englische Literatur (Wissenschaftliche Forschungsberichte 11). Bern. pp. 422. Fr. 41.50.
- STANDOP, E. Syntax und Semantik der modalen Hilfsverben im Altenglischen. Bochum-Langendreer. pp. 178. DM. 20.00.
- STEIN, A. Heroic Knowledge. An Interpretation of *Paradise Regained* and *Samson Agonistes*. Minneapolis; London. pp. xiv+238. 40s.
- STERN, M. R. The Fine Hammered Steel of Herman Melville. Urbana, Ill. pp. xii+298. \$5.75.
- STUDIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE presented to Prof. Dr. Karl Brunner on his Seventieth Birthday, ed. S. Korninger. Wien-Stuttgart. pp. x+290. \$6.20.
- SURTZ, L. The Praise of Wisdom. A Commentary on St. Thomas More's *Utopia*. Chicago. pp. x+402.
- THOMAS, J. W. (ed.). The Letters of James Freeman Clarke to Margaret Fuller. Hamburg. pp. 148. DM. 12.00.
- TILANDER, G. Nouveaux Essais d'étymologie cynégétique. Lund. pp. 242. Kr. 30.00.
- TILLOTSON, K. Matthew Arnold and Carlyle. Proc. Brit. Acad. XLII, pp. 133-53. 3s. 6d.
- TODD, F. M. Politics and the Poet. A Study of Wordsworth. pp. 238. 25s.
- TUVE, R. Images and Themes in Five Poems by Milton. Cambridge, Mass.; London. pp. viii+162. 25s.
- URE, J. M. (ed.). The Benedictine Office. An Old English Text. Edinburgh. pp. x+142. 15s.
- WEDGWOOD, C. V. The Common Man in the Great Civil War. Leicester. pp. 24. 3s.
- WILDE, O., and his Literary Circle. A Catalog of Manuscripts and Letters in the William Andrews Clark Memorial Library, comp. J. C. Finzi. Berkeley. pp. xxxiv+2,892 items.
- WILSON, F. P. and WILSON, J. D. Sir Edmund Kerchever Chambers 1866-1954. Proc. Brit. Acad. XLII, pp. 267-85. 2s. 6d.
- WILSON, H. S. On the Design of Shakespearean Tragedy. Toronto; London. pp. viii+256. 40s.
- WILSON, K. G. (ed.). The Complaint Against Hope. Ann Arbor. pp. vi+48. \$1.50.
- WINNY, J. The Descent of Euphues. Three Elizabethan Romance Stories: Euphues, Pandosto, Piers Plainness. pp. xxvi+180. 16s.
- WRIGHT, H. G. Boccaccio in England from Chaucer to Tennyson. pp. xiv+496. 63s.
- YU, M. S. Two Masters of Irony. Annotations on Three Essays by Oscar Wilde and Lytton Strachey. Hong Kong; London. pp. viii+42.

ar-  
53.

A

ive  
ss.;

ce,  
pp.

i in  
24.

A  
s in  
trial  
ley.

Sir  
66-  
85.

ake-  
lon.

aint  
-48.

ues.  
ries:  
pp.

from  
496.

nno-  
Vilde  
ong;